STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF WORLD COMMUNISM

(THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MATUSOW CASE)

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

PURSUANT TO

S. Res. 58

FEBRUARY 28, 1955

PART 3

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
59886 WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee	WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Missouri	ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
PRICE DANIEL, Texas	HERMAN WELKER, Idaho
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming	JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Missouri	HERMAN WELKER, Idaho
PRICE DANIEL, Texas	JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

J. G. SOURWINE, *Chief Counsel*
RICHARD ARENS and ALVA C. CARPENTER, *Associate Counsels*
BENJAMIN N. MANDEL, *Director of Research*

TESTIMONY RELATING TO HARVEY M. MATUSOW

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1955

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL
SECURITY LAWS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1:35 p. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, Senator James O. Eastland (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Eastland, Johnston of South Carolina, McClellan, Hennings, Daniel, and Welker.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Alva C. Carpenter, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Robert C. McManus, professional staff member.

Senator JOHNSTON (presiding). The hearing will come to order. The witness will raise his right hand and take the oath.

Do you swear that the evidence you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS ATTORNEY, STANLEY FAULKNER—Resumed

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, we were talking about your testimony with respect to Clinton Jencks the last time you were on the stand.

Did you ever discuss with Clinton Jencks your chapter, the chapter of your book, on the Jencks case or your affidavit in the Jencks case?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever discuss either your chapter of the book or your affidavit in this case with any persons other than Mr. Cameron, Mr. Kahn, Mr. Nathan Witt, and the attorney for Clinton Jencks?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever discuss either your chapter on the Jencks case or your affidavit in that case with any officials of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not hear the end of your question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Any officials of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you inform the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Clinton Jencks is or was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe at some time or another I did that.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you did that, was it, to your knowledge, an untruth?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not hear that statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you informed the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Clinton Jencks is or was a Communist, was that, to your knowledge, an untruth?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you name other individuals to the FBI as Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall at this time. I might have.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were making reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you have congressional immunity?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me, sir?

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were making reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you have congressional immunity?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I know of.

Mr. SOURWINE. It has been stated that your testimony at all times and your information at all times in the naming of individuals as Communists was under congressional immunity. That is not so, is it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not familiar with that aspect of the law. I presume, no, but I don't know.

Senator JOHNSTON. Does the witness object to this lighting [indicating floodlights and spotlights]?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you gave information to the FBI, Mr. Matusow, what was your purpose in giving that information?

Mr. MATUSOW. The purpose was to report on activities of people I knew.

Mr. SOURWINE. No; not what you did—but what your purpose was in doing it.

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my answer to your question, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, did you have any purpose to aid your country in exposing Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have any purpose to make financial gain for yourself?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it your purpose to deceive the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I presume you are referring to the period of my membership in the Communist Party, when I was reporting to the FBI?

Mr. SOURWINE. That is correct.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, if it was your purpose, sir, at that time, to serve your country by helping to expose Communists, as you have said it was, and if it was not your purpose at that time to deceive the FBI, as you have said it was not, why do you now say that information which you gave the FBI at that time was false?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say all the information was false. I don't know which information was true or false. I haven't seen those reports, but at this time I realize, I believe I am serving my country

a lot better by exposing the informer racket and the people who do give false information.

I have nothing against the FBI or their evaluation of facts, but when they base their facts upon irresponsible people, such as I have been in the past, and Mr. Crouch, and Mr. Budenz, and they are doing something harmful and false, then I think it is my job as a citizen to expose them.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. Senator Daniel.

Senator DANIEL. You are not speaking for other witnesses now. Mr. Chairman, he should be advised not to speak as to others except as to what this witness may know as to facts within his knowledge, not what other witnesses have said.

Senator JOHNSTON. Will you please confine your remarks to things of your own knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I do know something of my own knowledge about Mr. Crouch.

Senator JOHNSTON. You testify concerning yourself, not Mr. Crouch.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. Senator Welker.

Senator WELKER. Before we leave the question of Clinton Jencks, may I inquire of you, Mr. Matusow, who that gentleman is?

Mr. MATUSOW. Clinton Jencks, is a member and, I presume, still is a leader of the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Union.

Senator WELKER. When and where did you first meet him?

Mr. MATUSOW. In the summer of 1950, at San Cristobal, N. Mex.

Senator WELKER. When did you last see him?

Mr. MATUSOW. During the month of January 1954, when he was a defendant in the trial I testified in.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were advance copies of your book sent to any point behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the daily report of foreign radio broadcasts from the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, which is No. 38, for 1955, on page GD–3. This report refers to a broadcast which was monitored from the Poland Home Service, Warsaw, on February 20, 1955.

It indicates that in that broadcast, the publisher of the Matusow book was lauded as showing great courage. It shows that the Polish announcer, broadcasting from that station behind the Iron Curtain, reviewed in detail the book False Witness, by Harvey Matusow, and, after having described the difficulties connected with its publication, then turned to a discussion of the Rosenberg case.

I would like to offer that for the record,[1] Mr. Chairman, and I would like to ask Mr. Matusow:

Can you, sir, explain, if no copies of your books were sent behind the Iron Curtain, how it happens that a Polish radio announcer over a Communist station behind the Iron Curtain was able to review that book fully on February 20 of this year?

---

[1] The document was numbered "Exhibit No. 10" and is in the subcommittee's files.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I said I have no knowledge of any copy of the book going behind the Iron Curtain, whether it went or did not go. Apparently it did, but I still have no knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. In view of the fact it was reviewed on the 20th of February, is it not true that at least one copy went back behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume so.

Senator WELKER. One question, Mr. Chairman.

Did you inquire of your publishers, Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn, as to whether or not any of the copies of your book went behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I made no such inquiry.

Senator WELKER. Yet they were financing you, and you had made a deal with them?

Mr. MATUSOW. They are book publishers, and I am a writer, and that is our arrangement.

Senator WELKER. How many books have you written prior to this?

Mr. MATUSOW. A volume of poetry.

Senator WELKER. How was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. A volume of poetry.

Senator WELKER. A volume of poetry.

Mr. MATUSOW. And one that Gipson was about to publish——

Senator WELKER. About to publish?

Mr. MATUSOW. Was at one time; was considering it.

Senator WELKER. He is not going to publish it now, is he?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so. He does not have the manuscript any more.

Senator WELKER. Now, I did not interrogate you when you appeared before the committee heretofore. I would like to ask, as background—and I am sorry if this is repetitious—as to just why you decided to tell the truth in any matter, as you claim?

Mr. MATUSOW. There are many reasons, sir. The main reason is my conscience.

Senator WELKER. Your conscience?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And I think I read in the press wherein you had gone to some bishop and conversed with him, to get relief for your conscience.

Mr. MATUSOW. I had conversed with the bishop——

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, while you were in the armed services and the Air Force of the United States, you went to the minister of the gospel, did you not, the chaplain of your base?

Mr. MATUSOW. At many times in my life I have gone to see men of God, and I believe my conversations with those men is a matter of privilege which I am not going to discuss.

Senator WELKER. And you went some years ago, 1951——

Mr. MATUSOW. And in 1931, and including my childhood——

Senator WELKER. In 1950 or 1951 you advised with your chaplain at the Air Force base, I think, at Brooks Field; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe, first, Brooks Air Force and Wright-Patterson, and two fields in New York City——

Senator WELKER. And he told you to meet some people; isn't that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. He didn't tell me; he suggested I meet with some people.

Senator WELKER. And they would relieve your conscience, or help you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe you got the story a little bit backwards.

Senator WELKER. Well, I may go into that a little fuller.

You were a pretty bad boy, weren't you, at one time, when you were in the Air Force?

Mr. MATUSOW. How do you mean—angry?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Why were you mad, angry, and——

Mr. MATUSOW. I wasn't mad; I was angry.

Senator WELKER. Why?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because I thought I could do a lot more for my country than I was doing in this country, and I had no knowledge that my mother sent the letter to the Air Force, requesting my staying in the United States, and I wanted to serve overseas during the Korea and the Air Force continuously——

Senator WELKER. As Air Force personnel, there were forms that you had to fill out, you were asked if you belonged to any subversive organization and notwithstanding the fact, according to your book, as I read it last night for the first time, you had been instructed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to communicate with the Air Force orally and not in writing——

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Senator WELKER. You listed 46, or 45 Communist fronts you belonged to, and the Communist Party; is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Counsel for the committee seems to dispute that fact, but it was approximately that number. I stated 45 or 46 in the book, sir, yes.

Senator WELKER. You stated 45 or 46 in the book, and that is what I am questioning on.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Not from counsel; I have not talked with him about it.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, I think you stated in your book you wanted to be cute when you did that. Can you tell us why you wanted to be cute?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea at the time why I wanted to be cute, but that was the attitude then.

Senated WELKER. Do you have any idea why you wanted to be cute?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think I am being cute; I am being very serious.

Senator WELKER. Well, you said you wanted to be cute; why did you want to be cute?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection of why.

Senator WELKER. You have no recollection.

Now, as a matter of fact, did you not make a statement in your book that you did this 180-degree turn solely to get even with the Air Force of the United States?

Mr. MATUSOW. What 180-degree turn are you referring to?

Senator WELKER. What is it then, 360 degrees?

Mr. MATUSOW. What turn are you referring to; what part of the book? I don't recall that statement.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall it?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, I will quote from page 47 of your book.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Next to the last paragraph on page 47:

"I made up my mind then"—I beg your pardon, sir. I will find the citation as to the exact page. I am apparently wrong with respect to the page.

Mr. MATUSOW. Might I suggest that there is a mention of 360 degrees, or 180 degrees, I believe, in a first draft of an early preface I wrote, myself. You might have seen that, and might be referring to it.

Senator WELKER. No; what I am asking you about, Mr. Matusow, is whether you didn't get mad with the Air Force and decide to get even with the Air Force.

Mr. MATUSOW. I got mad at the Air Force bureaucracy. I thought the Air Force was not effectively fighting communism in an orientation or education way, and I thought I had something to contribute.

Senator WELKER. And you were at that time dedicated, then, to fighting for the free world against communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I still am dedicated to fighting for the free world against communism.

Senator WELKER. Against communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Against totalitarianism, communism, fascism, or any other ism.

Senator WELKER. Before I go further, I want to ask you whether or not you know a gentleman by the name of Herbert Tank.

Mr. MATUSOW. I do, sir.

Senator WELKER. How long have you known him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I met him formally in the month of January of this year.

Senator WELKER. The month of January of this year?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Although you are dedicated still to a fight against communism or any totalitarianism——

Mr. MATUSOW. Communism or fascism——

Senator WELKER. Now, just a moment, please.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you inquire of Mr. Tank whether he ever belonged to one of those organizations?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You did not feel free to do that?

Mr. MATUSOW. None of my business what anybody else's political belief. If they care to tell me, it is their position.

Senator WELKER. And yet in the past month, with the exception of 8 days, you have lived with him; is that not right?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might be 10 days.

Senator WELKER. Eight or 10 days?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I have been with him a lot.

Senator WELKER. And he has paid all of your expenses?

Mr. MATUSOW. Most of my expenses.

Senator WELKER. He has fed you and he has seen that you received lodging; is that a correct statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. The lodging, I believe, was taken care of by my apartment. At times when we were traveling out of New York City he took care of the hotel bills; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you know who it was that compensated Mr. Tank for any out-of-pocket money he may have spent?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume it was my publisher, but I didn't inquire.

Senator WELKER. You didn't inquire?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You didn't think that it was necessary to know whether or not you were running a bill to be charged against you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't run up big bills, and I don't have a conscience that bothers me——

Senator WELKER. You don't have a conscience that bothers you about big bills?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't run up big bills.

Senator WELKER. I see. But yet you don't know who was furnishing Mr. Tank with the money?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, in my past life I was very snoopy and nosy; I am not that way any more.

Senator WELKER. Not very snoopy?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. What was the business of Mr. Tank in his association with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Many things.

Senator WELKER. What?

Mr. MATUSOW. One, he is working on a play.

Senator WELKER. Working on a play?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Based on this book or yourself?

Mr. MATUSOW. Based on certain experiences I had; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Is that all that he——

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I said that was one reason.

He was also—Mr. Tank has also been with me because we felt, that is, Mr. Tank and I and my publishers, that because of the controversy which was stirred up after I filed or gave the attorneys to file affidavits in two cases, and the announcement of my book was coming out, it would be best to have somebody with me——

Senator WELKER. That was to keep you from being assaulted or attacked by crackpots?

Mr. MATUSOW. In fact, sir, I got crackpot letters and——

Senator WELKER. And also the members of the committee have received such letters; in the last 4 years that I have been here I have; but have you ever feared for your life by virtue of those crackpot letters?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did up to a point, but I believe now it is a matter of public responsibility and trust, just the same type of public responsibility and trust that you have, sir, and that is the reason nobody attacks Members of the United States— or very seldom attempt to attack a Congressman; but at one point that situation was not so with me.

Senator WELKER. Now, did this gentleman, Mr. Tank, ever help edit this book called the False Witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Senator WELKER. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I can only speak of my knowledge, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, certainly, you had access to the book all the time——

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; and every sentence in that book was mine.

Senator WELKER. It was your own writing, or dictated by you?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you mean to say he had no part whatsoever in helping you edit the book; are we——

Mr. MATUSOW. Now, wait a minute, sir. Here is what I want to say.

He did not edit the book to my knowledge. In the last few days of correcting galley proofs of this book—you edit grammatics and only grammatics, not substance—Mr. Tank might have, I don't know if he did—might have made some corrections in relation to grammar.

Senator WELKER. Now, my concluding question before I give this matter back to counsel:

As a matter of fact, you accused Mr. Tank at one time of being a Communist, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; he, among other people.

Senator WELKER. And you changed your conclusion on that?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I called Mr. Tank a member of the Communist Party, I had no knowledge of such membership.

Senator WELKER. You had no knowledge of such membership?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had no knowledge.

Senator WELKER. Now, since you have been traveling around the country and since he has been your bodyguard——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe the term "bodyguard" is right.

Senator WELKER. I will do the questioning, and you can correct me later.

He has been your friend, a man to protect you against crackpots, violence——

Mr. MATUSOW. I think you are going a little too far—violence—I think you are trying to create an impression that does not exist.

Senator WELKER. We will take care of that question, too, later.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever ask Mr. Tank after once accusing him of being a member of the Communist Party whether or not in fact he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not, sir, and I state again—it is none of my business.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever told him you were humbly sorry for accusing him, prior to meeting him last January?

Mr. MATUSOW. I told Mr. Tank I was sorry for falsely accusing him. I said, "You might or might not be, but I don't care if you are or aren't."

Senator WELKER. In other words, you say you are still dedicated to the fight for the free world against communism and all these other isms?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right.

Senator WELKER. You still don't care whether a man who has been living with you for all except 8 or 10 days for the past month,

whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party; is that a correct statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't care one way or another, sir. It is none of my business.

Senator WELKER. None of your business?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you want to change your statement about you being still dedicated in the fight against communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Let a war start with the United States fighting any aggressor and see how fast I get into service, and I think that will answer the question. I volunteered once, and I will volunteer——

Senator WELKER. How did you get out of the last one?

Mr. MATUSOW. Honorably.

Senator WELKER. Honorably. But you had to make a deal, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. What are you talking about?

Senator WELKER. According to your book, you stated by mutual agreement with the Air Corps and you——

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my discharge from the Air Force Reserve, not separation from active duty.

Senator WELKER. When were you separated?

Mr. MATUSOW. If you would like the exact date, I will give it to you.

Senator WELKER. I would like to have it.

Mr MATUSOW. I will give the date for my separation from active duty, and let the committee check on it and put an end to this nonsense.

Honorable separation from active duty, United States Air Force, active duty from March 1, 1951, to December 11, 1951.

Senator WELKER. I have not stated you were not honorably discharged. I am merely stating a remark made by you in your so-called book here, called False Witness, in which it was stated, and I read it last night, about mutual agreement between you, Mr. Witness, and the Air Force; you were dicharged from the Air Force.

Mr. MATUSOW. And there is another honorable discharge [exhibiting]; that is from the infantry in World War II.

Senator WELKER. I have read all that, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir; keep the record straight on it, that is all.

Senator WELKER. I will turn the witness back to counsel.

Senator DANIEL. Along that same line of questioning, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. Senator Daniel.

Senator DANIEL. I understod you to say that you thought Tank was a Communist; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my surmise, one time.

Senator DANIEL. And you thought that the other day, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said when I accused him of it, I thought he was a Communist, but I didn't know.

Senator DANIEL. And the other day, the last time I heard you testify, didn't you say you still thought he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know; might have. I would like to see the record on that.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't you tell the committee you thought your publisher, Angus Cameron, was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I doubt that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you now deny you told this committee you thought your publisher——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't either confirm or deny; I would like to see the record.

Senator DANIEL. Did you or did you not deny to this committee you thought your publisher, Angus Cameron, was a Communist or member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would like to see the record before I answer that question, sir. I don't have any recollection of the testimony.

Senator DANIEL. Well, what is the truth about the case? Don't you think your publisher, Angus Cameron, is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir, and I don't care.

Senator DANIEL. I ask you what your thought is about it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I just told you, sir; I don't know and don't care.

Senator DANIEL. You don't know and don't care?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Don't you think now your publisher, Mr. Kahn, is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir; I haven't given much thought to it.

Senator DANIEL. What is your belief and thought about your publisher, Mr. Kahn, being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I say, I haven't given much thought to it.

Senator DANIEL. None whatever?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know one way or another.

Senator DANIEL. What is your present belief about Mr. Herb Tank being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I state again, sir, I don't know and don't care.

Senator DANIEL. Don't know and don't care?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right.

Senator DANIEL. You have no idea whether he is or not?

Mr. MATUSOW. My relationship with people is based on the basis of friendship and not political belief.

Senator DANIEL. And you want this committee to believe you are still against the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am against communism and all "isms."

Senator DANIEL. And not caring one way or another as to whether the man you lived with most of the time, or your publisher, or——

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, the Bible teaches me to be against sins and not sinners, don't forget—it is the teaching of all religions.

Senator DANIEL. You want this committee to believe you are telling the truth now?

Mr. MATUSOW. I know I am telling the truth, and I want this committee to believe it.

Senator DANIEL. You are against the Communist Party and the Communist conspiracy, although you don't care whether your publishers and the man living with you are members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I am against the sin, not the sinner.

Senator DANIEL. I said, is that what you want the committee to believe?

Mr. MATUSOW. My statement is clear. Yes, sir, I am against the sin, not the sinner.

Senator DANIEL. All right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you consider membership in the Communist Party an intellectual pursuit?

Mr. MATUSOW. If we are going on that subject sir, look, I am not an expert on communism. Why do you want my opinion of communism?

Mr. SOURWINE. I want your opinion on that question, because you have at least twice here referred to the Communist Party as being a man's politics or how he thought, and I want to find out what state your mind is about it:

Do you consider Communist membership as merely a matter of belief or a matter of politics?

Mr. MATUSOW. Most of the Communists whom I have met in my life were intellectual Communists.

Mr. SOURWINE. That does not answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, that is my belief——

Mr. SOURWINE. Your belief is that most Communists are intellectual Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said, most Communists whom I knew as Communists, and that is the only realm about Communists I am talking about, American Communists——

Mr. SOURWINE. My question still remains:

Do you believe that being a Communist is merely a matter of intellectual belief?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no opinion one way or another on that. The only opinion I have is based on my own relationship with certain members of the Communist Party a number of years ago, and those whom I knew were Communists, for the most part, intellectually.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know, Mr. Matusow, that a member of the Communist Party is a member of a conspiracy to overthrow the governments of all countries——

Mr. MATUSOW. Well——

Mr. SOURWINE. Which are based on free enterprise?

Mr. MATUSOW. My knowledge of that question and the answer to it has been obtained through testimony such as mine from ex-Communists who are hungry for a dollar, and I wouldn't believe a word they say, and if I am going to base an opinion on a bunch of liars, as I had been in the past, it would be one opinion I wouldn't give credence to.

Senator WELKER. May I question on that line?

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Senator WELKER. If I recall your testimony correctly, you have testified to familiarity with the force and violence passage in the Communist Manifesto; is that correct? Is that correct or false?

Mr. MATUSOW. Counsel asked me if I ever read that, and I stated "yes."

Senator WELKER. And you stated you were familiar with it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had read it, that was the answer; I believe I was familiar in that respect.

Mr. SOURWINE. And who are those people who believe in the force and violence clause of the manifesto—intellectuals?

Mr. MATUSOW. I say, the Communist Party members I knew were intellectual Communists. If you want to know them—they were not capable of violence.

Mr. SOURWINE. How is that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I didn't believe any of them were capable of violence. A bunch of 18- and 19-year-old kids.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't limit yourself to 18- or 19-year-old kids.

Mr. MATUSOW. I was in the Communist Youth, and I came into these committees and told a lot of tall tales, don't forget that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am quite mindful of the tales you told, sir.

Have you met any kind of an adult member of the Communist Party

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you care to name them?

Mr. MATUSOW. Ask me about them and I will tell you.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. I am asking you. You told me you knew some adult members.

Now tell me who they were.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that I stated the other day, the national committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want the individuals.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, there were Eugene Dennis; Henry Winston; Gil Green; Bill Norman; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and a few others.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Matusow, do you remember having testified that you made, and I use your words, "about $2," picking cotton on a farm in Texas while you were on your way to New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I believe I testified.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember how much you did make, in fact?

Mr. MATUSOW. Two dollars. I don't recall. It was in the vicinity of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, was it more or less?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the vaguest recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you had 'volunteered the amount in your previous testimony. I did not. You had volunteered the amount.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said it was in the vicinity of $2; if it was $2.20 or $2.80, I don't remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that the first time you had ever picked cotton?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long did it take you to earn that approximately $2?

Mr. MATUSOW. I worked through a good part of the day.

Mr. SOURWINE. I believe you said 6 or 7 hours.

Mr. MATUSOW. Probably.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you had been up all night the night before?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say that. I said I didn't camp out. I believe I said I slept in a truck which I hitchhiked in.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't know how long you slept?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I was not logging that trip.

Mr. SOURWINE. This trip—you said you were relaxing?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know, Mr. Matusow, that anybody who knows very much about picking cotton will find it incredible that you picked somewhere around 100 pounds of cotton in 6 or 7 hours the first time you ever tried it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say I picked 100 pounds of cotton.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much did you say you picked?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recollect.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you testify you were getting $2.80 for 100 pounds?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. You are asking me a question about something which I just did for relaxation, as I called it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you a question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I don't know, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the witness be admonished to let the questions be asked and then to answer.

Senator JOHNSTON. Please let the attorney ask the question, and after you have answered the question, you will have ample opportunity to explain.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you, Mr. Matusow, about testimony you gave under oath during the past week.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I realize that; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, Mr. Matusow, ever get money from Nathan Witt or from his law firm at any time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I received a 25-cent good-luck token, and since then a 15-cent subway token.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever receive any other money from Nathan Witt or from his law firm at any time?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you furnish the committee, sir, with an itemized account of all moneys received by you from Cameron & Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would have to get that from the publisher. I will endeavor to do so.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean you have no records of your own?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe the publishers are keeping adequate records. I don't have to.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is, whether you have records of your own.

Mr. MATUSOW. On that score, no, sir; not yet.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember testifying, Mr. Matusow, you had a wire tape of conversations, conversations between you and Mr. Kahn, and tape recordings of conversations between Communist union leaders?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you still have the wire tape?

Mr. MATUSOW. I could endeavor to locate it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked if you still had it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. I will have to check. I have got over 200 hours of tape recordings, and I would have to play them to find out if I still had it.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean you had an item like that and made no effort to put it in a safe place?

Mr. MATUSOW. That particular item, that is right, sir. No effort.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever give that wire or recording or a duplicate of it to a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the witness be instructed if he still has it or if it is under his control, that particular recording be furnished to the committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will endeavor to, sir. I might suggest the easiest way to get it would be to contact Mr. Don Surine; I believe he still knows where the recording is. The last time I saw it—I turned the original over to him, it was played, and sent to McCarthy's office.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you were the one that brought up the matter of that tape recording and testified, and the committee is attempting to secure a copy about which you testified.

Mr. MATUSOW. There were two copies. One I gave back, personally saw him place it in bookshelves with a number of others, and sent to McCarthy a dubbing of the original.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you will remember we had some discussion here the other day about the personal history statement you filled out.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you stated you had filled it out—filled out two such statements.

Mr. MATUSOW. Two or more.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, how many more?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you first fill one out?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I went to the Air Force.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, after I went in, in February, but I was still in reserve, and the active duty supposedly started March 1, so I was there a month earlier.

Mr. SOURWINE. So you filled out the first one in February or March of what year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you fill it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Brooks Air Force, at San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not fill out a personal history statement for the Air Force before that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my recollection. I might have, though.

Mr. SOURWINE. And when did you fill out the second?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe on the other, at Kirtland Air Force, at Albuquerque. The Air Force might turn up another one. That was prior to going on active duty.

Mr. SOURWINE. One personal history statement was the one you put down 40 or more?

Mr. MATUSOW. Forty on that—I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you put down that number the first time you filled out such a statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have a recollection at this point, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You put it down on some subsequent statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. Either first or second, I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. If the Air Force should produce officers to testify you only filled out two such statements, would you admit that to be the truth?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; because the Air Force officials will prove that point wrong. Every time an airman, when he is transferred to a new unit, he, by regulation, must fill out a new personal history statement. That was the Air Force regulation, I believe, dealing with security—no, that would have been—I could check that regulation for you, and

every time you enter a new unit, you fill out one, and I was in more than two units.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then why did you have difficulty in testifying whether you filled out more than two?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, you have been refreshing my recollection, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you now testify whether you filled out more than two such statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. I cannot right now. I think the Air Force would have to come in, and I would have to do some checking.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a letter of transmittal and a photostat of a statement, a personal history statement filled out by Mr. Matusow, presumably the first one he filled out.

I would like to offer the letter, and I would like to send this photostat down to the witness and ask him if it is a statement which he filled out at Kirtland Air Force, and if the signature on there is his.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I have it back?

Mr. Matusow——

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer this for the record as the next exhibit.

Senator JOHNSTON. It may be admitted.

(The documents were numbered 11A and 11B and appear below.)

EXHIBIT NO. 11–A

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 25, 1955.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security,
Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with a request made by Mr. Columbo of your subcommittee staff, attached is a copy of the personal history statement (WD AGO Form 643A) completed at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., on February 13, 1951, by Harvey M. Matusow.

The national agency check was not made on the basis of this personal history statement but on the one executed on March 7, 1951, a copy of which was transmitted to you by letter dated February 21, 1955, and signed by Mr. Frederick Ayer, Jr., special assistant to the Secretary.

As was pointed out in Mr. Ayer's letter of February 21, personal history statements are not, except under extraordinary circumstances, released to congressional committees. In the case of Harvey Matusow the Secretary has consented to the release of these documents to assist the committee in its inquiry into the veracity of this witness.

Sincerely yours,

JOE W. KELLY,
Major General, USAF,
Director, Legislative Liaison.

PERSONAL HISTORY STATEMENT

Read the certificate at the end of this questionnaire before filling in your answers. Prefer to type all answers. All questions and statements must be completed. If proper answer is "No" or "None," so state. Detail is requested for your protection since in subsequent investigations which may or may not include discrepancy information on persons of same or similar names may be disclosed and background information is needed for exact identification. Fill out, sign, and execute in duplicate and return both copies to requesting agency. If more space is required, use space "Remarks" or attach separate sheet.

DATE: 13 February 1951	PLACE: Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico
1. LAST NAME (NEE NAME) - FIRST NAME - MIDDLE NAME: Matusow, Harvey Harshell	2. FORMER NAMES, AKA'S, OR CHANGES OF NAME: Harvey Matt, Matt
3. PRESENT RANK (Write out grade for regular Army or Air Force officers only): S/Sgt	4. ARM OR SERVICE: USAF
5. SERIAL NO.: AF 12229061	6. DRAFT BOARD NO.: Not known
7. PRESENT OFFICIAL ADDRESS: New York City, New York	
8. PRESENT MILITARY ASSIGNMENT (Do not use abbreviations. Give name of unit and location. Do not merely repeat answer to item 4. If with overseas command, indicate): Hq & Hq Sq., 14th Air Force	
9. LAST CIVILIAN ADDRESS (Street and number, city, county, and State):	10. PERMANENT HOME ADDRESS (Street and number, city, and State): General Delivery - Albuquerque, New Mexico
11. RACE: White	12. HEIGHT: 5 FT. 7 IN.
13. WEIGHT: 130 LB.	14. COLOR OF EYES: Brown
15. COLOR OF HAIR: Black	16. COMPLEXION: Ruddy
17. CITIZENSHIP (Name country): United States	18. HOW ACQUIRED: ☒ BY BIRTH ☐ NATURALIZATION ☐ THROUGH PARENTS' NATURALIZATION
19. IF NATURALIZED, GIVE NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE NO.: No	20. PLACE NATURALIZED (Court and location of court, city, and State): None
21. DATE NATURALIZED: None	
22. DATE AND PORT OF ENTRY TO U. S. (If born outside of U. S. and its territories): None	
23. DATE OF BIRTH: October 3, 1926	24. PLACE OF BIRTH (City, county, State, and country): Bronx, New York

25. DO YOU HAVE A BIRTH CERTIFICATE?	26. IS IT RECORDED?	27. WHERE RECORDED?
☒ YES ☐ NO	XX YES ☐ NO	Bronx County, New York

28. SCARS OR DISTINGUISHING MARKS

None

29. EDUCATION (*List Grammar Schools, High Schools, and Colleges*)

SCHOOL ATTENDED	LOCATION	TYPE	DATES OF ATTENDANCE	GRADUATED OR DEGREE CONFERRED
Public School 70	Bronx, New York	Grammer	? ?	-
Public School 104	Bronx, New York	Grammer	1936 - 1939	Yes
Public School 82	Bronx, New York	Grammer	1939 - 1941	Yes
Wm H. Taft High School	Bronx, New York	High Sch	1941 - 1944	Yes
City College	New York City, New York	Non Matic'l	1946 - 1947	No

30. SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL HONORS, SCHOLARSHIPS, ETC., ATTAINED

None

31. MEMBERSHIP IN SCHOOL SOCIETIES, FRATERNITIES, OR CLUBS (*List all*)

None

32. LIST ALL ORGANIZATIONS, SOCIETIES, CLUBS, AND ASSOCIATIONS, PAST OR PRESENT, IN WHICH YOU HAVE HELD MEMBERSHIP (*Other than shown in Item 31*)

✓Communist Party U.S.A. 1
✓American Youth for Democracy 2
Labor Youth League
✓Jefferson School
Young Progessives of America
✓American Labor Party, N.Y. State Camp Unity
✓Civil Rights Congress
✓Peoples Songs
✓Peoples Artists
United Office & Prof Workers Union Local 16
* American Newspaper Guild
✓Progressive Party

* Not a member of any of the above at present with the Exception of American Newspaper Guild.

WDFORM 643A Gov't

33. RESIDENCE FROM BIRTH

DATE (From—To)		STREET AND NUMBER	CITY	STATE OR COUNTRY
Oct 3 - 1926	1928	Mt Eden & Townsend Ave	Bronx N.Y.	New York
1928	1931	1504 Morris Ave	Bronx N.Y.	New York
1931	1935	1566 Macombs Road	Bronx N.Y.	New York
1935	1941	1568 Macombs Road	Bronx N.Y.	New York
1941	1948	1491 Macombs Road	Bronx N.Y.	New York
May 1943	1948	56 W. 18th St	Bronx N.Y.	New York
May 1948	Sept 1948	1491 Macombs Road	Bronx N.Y.	New York
Jan 1950	July 1950	167 W. 60th St	New York C.	New York
Aug 1950	Jan 1950	Taos General Delivery	Taos	New Mexico

34. EMPLOYMENT (*Including part time*)

A. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN EMPLOYED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF A FOREIGN NATION AS A CIVILIAN? ☐ YES ☒ NO
IF YES, GIVE NATION OF SERVICE:

DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED AS	EMPLOYED BY (*Division, dept., or agency*)
None	None	None

LOCATION (*City and country*)	REASON FOR TERMINATION
None	None

B. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN EMPLOYED BY A PRIVATE FIRM OF A FOREIGN NATION? ☐ YES ☐ NO. IF YES, GIVE NAME AND LOCATION OF FIRM.
None

DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED AS	LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT
None	None	None

REASON FOR TERMINATION
None

C. EMPLOYMENT OTHER THAN ABOVE (*In chronological order—including part time*) — SOCIAL SECURITY NO. 119-20-6248

DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED BY (*Give name, street and number, city, and State*)
Nov 1941 - Mar. 1944	Philip Mendeliwitz - 897 Morris Ave Bronx, New York

EMPLOYED AS	REASON FOR TERMINATION
Clerk in Cigar Store	Ready to go into service
DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and State)
Mar 15 1947 -Sept 15 1947	Grey Adv Agency 166 W. 32nd St New York City, NewNYork
EMPLOYED AS	REASON FOR TERMINATION
Production Assistant	Not enough pay
DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and State)
Sept 15 1947 - Mar 1948	Noel Wesley Productions 234 W 44th St. New York City, NY
EMPLOYED AS	REASON FOR TERMINATION
Production Assistant	Not enough work - Election Camp for Wallace
DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and State)
May 1948 Sept 1948	Jefferson Book Shop 575 6th Ave, New York City, New York
EMPLOYED AS	REASON FOR TERMINATION
Salesman	No work after summer
DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and State)
Sept 1948 March 1949	Peoples Songs 126 W. 21st St New York City, N. Y.
EMPLOYED AS	REASON FOR TERMINATION
Salesman	Organization folded
DATE (From—To)	EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and State)
May 1949 June 1949	Communist Party 35 E. 12th St New York County, N. Y.
EMPLOYED AS	REASON FOR TERMINATION
Switchboard Operator	To go to work at Camp Unity

D. NAME AND LOCATION OF EMPLOYING AGENCY OF WAR DEPARTMENT (*For civilians only*)

None

JOB TITLE	DOES POSITION INVOLVE HANDLING CLASSIFIED MATERIAL? IF YES, GIVE CLASSIFICATION
None	None

35. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN FIRED, ASKED TO RESIGN, FURLOUGHED (*other than regular furlough or leave*) OR PUT ON AN INACTIVE STATUS FOR CAUSE WHILE SERVING IN THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, OR COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OR IN ANY POSITION OF PRIVATE OR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT? IF SO, STATE CIRCUMSTANCES.

No.

16—82216-1

36. HAVE YOU EVER FILED APPLICATIONS FOR ANY FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS? ☐ YES ☐ NO

TITLES OF EXAMINATIONS	EXAMINED IN WHAT CITIES	MONTH AND YEAR	RATING
None	None	None	None

37. MILITARY HISTORY

A. DATE ENLISTED	DATE INDUCTED (*If E. M.*)	ENLISTED SERIAL NO.	DATE OF LAST DISCHARGE AS E. M.	DISCHARGE
Nov 6, 1943	Oct 31, 1944	12220061	Aug 3, 1946	☐ W/O SPECIFICATION ☒ HONORABLE ☐ DISHONORABLE
WO—DATE OF WARRANT	**WARRANT SERIAL NO.**	**DATE RELIEVED AS WO**	**DATE OF FIRST COMMISSIONED APPOINTMENT**	
None	None	None	None	
SOURCE OF COMMISSION	**COMPONENT (*RA, ORC, NG, AUS, Navy, Marine, or Coast Guard*)**		**DATE ENTERED ACTIVE DUTY**	**DATE SEPARATE OR EXPIRATION OF TERMINAL LEAVE**
None	AUS		Oct 31, 1944	

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN COURT-MARTIALED? ☐ YES ☒ NO. IF YES, EXPLAIN FULLY

None

B. HAVE YOU EVER SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OF A FOREIGN NATION? ☐ YES ☒ NO

NATION OF SERVICE: | PERIOD OF SERVICE (*From—To*): None | ARM OR SERVICE: None

HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED	SERIAL NO.	DISCHARGE
None	None	None ☐ HONORABLE ☐ W/O SPECIFICATION ☐ DISHONORABLE ☐ TRF TO AMERICAN ARMED FORCES

38. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED OR OVERSEAS DUTY

COUNTRY	DATE	LENGTH OF STAY	PURPOSE
France	April 1945		Overseas Duty
Germany	to		
	July 12, 1946		

39. **FOREIGN LANGUAGES** (*Indicate: fluent, fair, poor*)

LANGUAGE	CONVERSE	READ	WRITE
Spanish	Some	Yes	No
French	Some	Yes	No
Italian	None	Yes	No
German	Some	Yes	No

40. **CREDIT REFERENCES** (*Give three*)

NAME	FULL ADDRESS
Chase National Bank	39 Pine St New York City, New York
Bankers Commercial Corporation	Madison Ave New York City, New York
First State Bank	Taos, New Mexico

41. **CHARACTER REFERENCES** (*Give five—Not employers or relatives*)

NAME	FULL ADDRESS
Irwin Grossack	1568 Macombs Road Bronx, New York
John S. Candeciro	Taos, New Mexico
Albert Feigen	3339 Hull Ave Bronx, New York
Irving Beilen	1566 Macombs Road, Bronx, New York
Albert Weiss	Mt. Edon Avenue, Bronx, New York

42. **FATHER**

FATHER'S LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME	☒ LIVING ☐ DECEASED	IF DECEASED, GIVE DATE
Matusow, Herman Jay		living

PRESENT ADDRESS OR LAST ADDRESS, IF DECEASED (*Street and number, city, State, and country*)

1491 Macombs Road Box 52 Bronx, New York

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (*Country*)	CITIZENSHIP (*Country*)
October 16, 1894 or 1896?	Russia	U.S.A.

IF YOUR CITIZENSHIP WAS DERIVED FROM FATHER'S NATURALIZATION, GIVE HIS NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE NUMBER, DATE, PLACE NATURALIZED, AND COURT OF JURISDICTION

No

OCCUPATION AND PRESENT EMPLOYER

Self Employed Cigar Store 71 W. 23rd St., New York City, N.Y.

16—8.240-1

43. **MOTHER**

MOTHER'S LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME	☒ LIVING ☐ DECEASED	IF DECEASED, GIVE DATE
Matusow, Sylvia Kitty		Living

PRESENT ADDRESS OR LAST ADDRESS, IF DECEASED (*Street and number, city, State, and country*): 1491 Macombs Road, Bronx, New York

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (*Country*)	CITIZENSHIP (*Country*)
October 15, 1899	Russia	U.S.A.

IF YOUR CITIZENSHIP WAS DERIVED FROM MOTHER'S NATURALIZATION, GIVE HER NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE NUMBER, DATE, PLACE, AND COURT OF JURISDICTION: NO

44. **STEPPARENT**

STEPPARENT'S LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME	ADDRESS (*Street and number, city, State, and country*)
None	None

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (*Country*)	CITIZENSHIP (*Country*)

OCCUPATION	PRESENT EMPLOYER

45. **GUARDIAN**

GUARDIAN'S LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME	ADDRESS (*Street and number, city, State, and country*)
None	None

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (*Country*)	CITIZENSHIP (*Country*)

OCCUPATION	PRESENT EMPLOYER

46. **FATHER-IN-LAW**

FATHER-IN-LAW'S LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME	☐ LIVING ☐ DECEASED	IF DECEASED, GIVE DATE
None		

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (*Country*)	CITIZENSHIP (*Country*)

OCCUPATION	PRESENT EMPLOYER

47. BROTHERS—SISTERS

SEX	NAME	AGE	FULL ADDRESS	OCCUPATION
M	Daniel B. Matusow	21	Killed in action W.W. II	SSN 12121523

48. RELATIVES LIVING IN FOREIGN LANDS

SEX	RELATIONSHIP	NAME	AGE	FULL ADDRESS	OCCUPATION
		None			

49. RELATIVES IN GOVERNMENT OR MILITARY SERVICE (*United States or Foreign*)

SEX	RELATIONSHIP	NAME	COUNTRY SERVED	TITLE OF POSITION AND DUTIES
		None		

50. MARITAL STATUS

☒ SINGLE ☐ MARRIED ☐ SEPARATED ☐ DIVORCED ☐ WIDOWER ☐ WIDOW

DATE OF MARRIAGE	PLACE OF MARRIAGE (*State and country*)
None	

NAME OF SPOUSE (*Last or maiden name, first name, middle name*) ☐ LIVING ☐ DECEASED

None

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH	CITIZENSHIP

ADDRESS PRIOR TO MARRIAGE (*Street and number, city, State, and country*)

PRESENT OCCUPATION	PRESENT EMPLOYER

19—52240-1

69886—55—pt. 3——4

51. FORMER SPOUSE

NAME OF FORMER SPOUSE (*Last or maiden name, first name, middle name*)	DATE AND PLACE OF MARRIAGE
None	

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (*City, State, and country*)

☐ LIVING ☐ DECEASED	DATE OF DIVORCE OR DEATH	PLACE

52. CHILDREN

SEX	NAME	AGE	FULL ADDRESS	OCCUPATION
	None			

53. DEPENDENTS

SEX	NAME	RELATIONSHIP	AGE	DEGREE OF DEPENDENCY
F	Sylvia K. Matusow	Mother	51	Partially

54. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN ARRESTED, INDICTED, OR CONVICTED FOR ANY VIOLATION OF LAW, OTHER THAN A MINOR TRAFFIC VIOLATION? ☐ YES ☒ NO. IF SO, STATE THE NAME AND PLACE OF COURT, NATURE OF OFFENSE, DATE, AND DISPOSITION OF CASE No.

55. ARE THERE ANY UNFAVORABLE INCIDENTS IN YOUR LIFE NOT MENTIONED ABOVE WHICH YOU BELIEVE MAY REFLECT UPON YOUR LOYALTY TO THE U. S. GOVERNMENT OR UPON YOUR ABILITY TO PERFORM THE DUTIES WHICH YOU WILL BE CALLED UPON TO UNDERTAKE? ☐ YES ☒ NO. IF SO, DESCRIBE (*If additional space is necessary, use Remarks.*)

(See Paragraph 32.)

56. NOTIFY IN CASE OF EMERGENCY (*Give name, relationship, and address*)

Mrs. Sylvia K. Matusow 1491 Macombs Road Bronx 52, New York

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING ANSWERS ARE TRUE, CORRECT, AND COMPLETE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF AND IN SIGNING THIS CERTIFICATE I DO SO WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE VERACITY OF ALL STATEMENTS MADE HEREIN WILL BE INVESTIGATED AND IF FOUND INCORRECT, INCOMPLETE, OR MISLEADING IN ANY PARTICULAR I MAY BE RELIEVED OF MY ASSIGNMENT AND SUCH OTHER DISCIPLINARY ACTION TAKEN AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE.

13 February 1951
(DATE)

Harvey M. Matusow
(SIGNATURE)

Harvey M. Matusow

Richard H. McLeroy
(WITNESS)

RICHARD H. McLEROY
Captain, USAF

5

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, I would like to ask with regard to the organizations which you listed here under item 32.

Mr. MATUSOW. May I respectfully submit to the committee, I know of at this time two additional personal history statements that were filled out at the Air Force. There were at least two other personal statements, I believe Form 346–A, if my memory is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you just looked at one and you didn't remember accurately. It is 643.

Mr. MATUSOW. That was a 6-page form in red, and the Air Force supplemented it with a 4-page white form sometime in 1951, and the other 2 statements were on the supplemental form or the one that superseded this 643–A.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that conclude your testimony you are volunteering about statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; so that it might be straight, and so that the committee might try to locate them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, on this question No. 32, which says, list of organizations and associations, past or present, in which you have been a member, you list 13 organizations.

Mr. MATUSOW. On that form; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, I would like to ask about this. This form appears to be dated——

Mr. MATUSOW. February 13, 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. February 13, 1951.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, were you, on February 13, 1951, a member of the Communist Party, U. S. A.?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was not, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you at that time a member of the American League for Democracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you at that time a member of the Labor Union League?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume—I had been expelled by that time, but I never received an official notice. I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the Jefferson School?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, student, or associated with them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the Young Progressives of America?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the American Labor Party, New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of Peoples Forum?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of Peoples Artists?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the United Office and Professional Workers Union Local 16?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the American Newspaper Guild?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I believe I was a member at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the Progressive Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of Camp Unity?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you prior to that time been a member of all those?

Mr. MATUSOW. A member of or associated with all those; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that the information that you gave on this form at this time was not untrue under question 32; was it?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, the answers I gave that I had been a member, was true, or had been associated with.

Mr. SOURWINE. There were no answers on this form which had been put down as "cute?"

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I thought at the time it was cute, putting them down as such; but not in your context, they were facts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you will remember our discussion earlier of the affidavit you gave the New York Times?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall it.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were requested to furnish the names of the six Communists you knew on the New York Times staff?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you furnish us those names now?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have been unable to get any recollection of it. I have no way of getting them, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is your response, you will not be able to furnish the committee with those names?

Mr. MATUSOW. When and if those names come to mind, the committee will have them; but at this point they are not—I tried thinking about them—and I don't want to invent names, as I have done in the past.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any record of those names?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever make any written records of those names?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have, I think—the reports I gave the FBI might have that, but I have not seen those reports and therefore don't have them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you ever read the pamphlet Communist on the Waterfront, written by Herb Tank?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection reading it. I have seen it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever read the pamphlet called Inside Job by Herb Tank?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have seen it. I don't believe I read it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever own either of these pamphlets?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever write your name in any of those pamphlets?

Mr. MATUSOW. Quite possible, if I own them.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you owned Communist literature, did you read much of it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I read some of it and some I did not read.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you stamp them for your library and put you name on books you did not read?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you know that the book Inside Job by Herb Tank, published in pamphlet form and having the subtitle The Story of a Labor Movement, containing the following statement on page 37——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I read it. I don't know any statements contained therein.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say you didn't read it?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is I didn't read it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I send to you a copy of Inside Job which bears on the front the stamp "Library of Harvey M. Matusow," and on the inside cover in the upper right-hand corner the word "Mat" written in ink, and ask you if that was a book at one time in your library, and if you wrote the "Mat" in the upper right-hand corner on that page.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. This book—that is my handwriting, and the book was apparently at one time in my library.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now that you have that book in your hand, does that refresh your recollection whether you read it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I have about 1,000 magazines and pamphlets in my library, and I don't believe I ever read this.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that, however, a part of your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. A part of my collection of Communist literature.

Mr. SOURWINE. Doesn't that say "by Herb Tank?" Didn't you know it was a book by Herb Tank when you had it in your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. Apparently so.

Mr. SOURWINE. And if you did not know Herb Tank was a Communist, how in the world did you classify this as "Communist literature" in your collection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, the book was published by New Century Publishers——

Mr. SOURWINE. Where do you find that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Page 2.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you have read page 2?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, if you want to split hairs, we can go on for days splitting hairs and we can be sitting here from now on until doomsday.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you were the one who testified before that you were here to split each hair, to find out the facts and——

Mr. MATUSOW. I will split hairs as long as you want to.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want an answer——

Mr. MATUSOW. And I say I haven't read that pamphlet and that is my answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, there is no need to raise your voice.

Mr. MATUSOW. You want to investigate a conspiracy of false witnesses or do you want to investigate somebody reading a pamphlet——

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, at the moment the committee is interested in you and the veracity of your statements, if any. I want to know if it is now your testimony that you did, when you had that book in the library, read that, the flyleaf——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't consider reading a flyleaf as reading a book——

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you testifying that you read the flyleaf?

Mr. MATUSOW. Apparently I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. More than "apparently." I want you to testify if you did.

Mr. MATUSOW. I say apparently I did. That is my answer for the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether you did or not?

Mr. MATUSOW. If I gave you a definite "yes" or "no" answer I would be lying. I say apparently I did, and that is my best recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Matusow, you don't have to lie to say "I don't know if I did or not," or "I do know."

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think "apparently I did" covers the answer, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. No, it does not.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, it does for me, sir. I don't know how to answer you in any other way.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want you to try to answer——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't want you to put words in my mouth, and I want you——

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, the witness is argumentative. I think he should cool down a little bit.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are an intelligent man, Mr. Matusow, and I think you realize when I pointed out to you that when you say "apparently I did," you are only talking about the effects of testimony, a fact that has already been disclosed.

The question of whether you now know whether you did is a matter which concerns a knowledge in your own mind concerning which no one else can testify. It is not "apparently" that you now know you did. I am asking, do you know or don't you know now that you had read at least as far as the first page of that book.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I read the flyleaf of the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, sir. May I have the book back, please.

You did testify you have read the cover—or would you not, Mr. Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I did read the cover.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you had no question this was a book by Herb Tank?

Mr. MATUSOW. The name "Herb Tank" is on that cover.

Mr. SOURWINE. And did you know it was put out by a Communist publisher?

Mr. MATUSOW. In that day I believed New Century Publishers to be a Communist publishing house and on the basis of my anti-Communist experience, I said so, that was my belief.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you changed that belief since then?

Mr. MATUSOW. It may be Communist, it might not, I have no direct knowledge of it being so, nothing that I know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this marked as the next numbered exhibit, that book.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be marked as the next exhibit.

(The document was numbered "Exhibit No. 12" and placed in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, in the present state of the record, Mr. Matusow, do you still want to testify you have no opinion as to whether Herb Tank is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I said, I have no opinion; I don't care one way or the other.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, in your book, sir, you told about——

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. You say you don't care whether he is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, previously I said I am against communism—the sin, not the sinner, and I base my relationships with people——

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you were against the theory but not the people who belonged to it; is that it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I don't ask people their political opinion. I associate with people regardless of who they are if I find them interesting and friendly, just as you as a Democrat associate with Republicans and the Republicans talk to you, and you don't ask about politics, and I make relationships with people on that same basis.

The CHAIRMAN. You think communism is just a political question, just another political party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said all the Communists or most of the Communists I knew as Communists were intellectual Communists and were not capable of violence; and I also stated for the record the fact that if you think I am not against any "ism" and wouldn't defend the United States against any attack——

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have said in your book that you had accumulated a few thousand books and pamphlets on Marxism——

Mr. MATUSOW. And other subjects.

Mr. SOURWINE. About how many thousand books and pamphlets were in your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. In my library are included much literature on folklore, music, arts——

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow——

Mr. MATUSOW. When you say "Communist literature," I never broke it down, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have had a collection of Communist literature, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am only concerned with that collection. I want to know how many thousand volumes.

Mr. MATUSOW. There aren't a thousand volumes in that collection, a few hundred pamphlets, a few hundred—100 books, maybe.

Mr. SOURWINE. So this library——

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I sold them at $600 or $700 at one point.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you not in your book False Witness say you had accumulated a few thousand books and pamphlets on Marxism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you want to tell us now that the few thousand you referred to in your book was in fact only a few hundred, maybe 100?

Mr. MATUSOW. It may have been a few thousand magazines, pamphlets, books——

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, have you not a moment ago denied that and said only a few hundred, maybe 100?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said to the best of my recollection and if I didn't, it should have been said. The answer could be gotten very easily by contacting the proprietor of Strand Book Shop on Fourth Avenue, who purchased complete libraries and made lists——

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, he didn't write False Witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. He did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You wrote that book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you testified to us that what you said in that book about accumulating a few thousand——

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, all right, sir, I am not going to argue that point, it is not important.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is not important whether you told lies in this book False Witness, that is extremely germane.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to know if it is true as stated in this book you had accumulated a few thousand books and pamphlets on Marxism.

Mr. MATUSOW. If I stated it, it is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you stated it, it is true?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that true of everything else you ever stated?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have come here to tell the committee I told falsehoods in the past so apparently it is not true.

Mr. SOURWINE. You realize that you have already testified here that everything in that book is true?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I did that, sir, outside of typographical errors.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, if the Strand Book Shop says that there were fewer than 200 books in the collection that you sold——

Mr. MATUSOW. Books and pamphlets?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Would you admit that the book was wrong?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would admit the Strand Book Shop proprietor is wrong.

Mr. SOURWINE. If the Strand Book Shop proprietor should testify there were fewer than 1,000 in that collection, would you admit that the book was wrong?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. I would have to see his list.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, now, a moment ago you said you did not have an independent recollection and you referred it to the Strand Book Shop for us to find out how many there were in your collection; didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, let us find out, and get to the point. This is kind of ridiculous——

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. Answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I would like to hear the question again.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think the question has been answered.

Did you read, Mr. Matusow, the majority of those books?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir. I have read parts of the majority of the books, I believe.

Mr. SOURWINE. You read parts of a majority of the books in your recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say then that it was a fair statement you had read parts of more than 100 books on communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I don't know if it would be or wouldn't. I haven't got any recollection at this point. A lot of my reading of that period was on American folklore.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have a collection of books on American folklore?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many books did you have in that collection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I had between 7 or 8 songbooks; I had 3 books by Crown—a history of American folklore, and I believe they just put 1 out for the South; and I had a book on John Henry—I had a number of books on John Henry—and Caxton——

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, Mr. Matusow, it sounds like more when you catalog them, but the question is, How many?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am trying to think how many. I would say maybe 35 to 50.

Mr. SOURWINE. As compared with hundreds or thousands in your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not say—also, I had novels, classics, books on art——

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were talking about folklore, did you testify you had 35 or——

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have 100.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, did you have 100?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Turning to another subject, Mr. Matusow——

Senator WELKER. If I may interrupt before counsel proceeds further, I would like to go back to this Air Force matter a little bit.

I direct your attention to page 40 of your so-called book, False Witness.

Mr. MATUSOW. Do you mind if I refer to it at the same time?

Senator WELKER. O. K., go ahead.

At the top of page 40, Mr. Matusow, line 6, you are relating that when you received a subpena to appear before a congressional committee you acted—

> Like a little boy running home with an A on his report card crying, "Mommy, mommy, see what I got." And everybody saw what I had. It was a bona fide subpena which entitled me to thumb my nose at the Air Force investigators. I had the power of Congress behind me.

And in the second paragraph you say:

> The lack of trust the Air Force had shown me was the straw that broke the camel's back in justifying my role as a witness.

And then you say on that same page:

> The Air Force had forced me, with my back to the wall, to a point where I was ready to crucify anyone publicly in order to get myself away from that bleak wall of insecurity.

Now, Mr. Matusow, going over to page 46, the next to the last paragraph of your so-called book, False Witness, you say:

> For up until this point I was still able to lie and bluff the public when I was accused of being a stool pigeon—a word which I hated violently.

Do you recall writing that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Taking it out of context as you are doing it, sir, I wrote those lines but not those thoughts in their entirety; you are leaving a false impression.

Senator WELKER. Is the committee to understand that you did hate the word "stool pigeon" violently?

Mr. MATUSOW. I hated it violently.

Senator WELKER. But notwithstanding that fact, you accepted when you were asked as a witness and went out crucifying people; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. I joined in with congressional committees and crucified people; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And then, directing your attention again—and we will not take it out of context any more—to paragraph No. 2 on page number 47 of your book, I quote:

> It was also important that I be in the headlines so I could refute the accusations that I was still a Communist and throw back into the faces of my Air Force accusers their distrust of me. I wanted to be able to say, "Yeah, you call me a Communist, but how many Communists have you put in jail?"

Now, did you so write that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I did, sir.

Senator WELKER. Then in the next paragraph you say:

> * * * I looked forward to the day I could say to my accusers, "I helped convict seventeen Communists."
> I made up my mind then and there to continue the role of witness.

And then the last words in that paragraph:

> Now I had the "badge of honor,"—a veteran of two wars.

Notwithstanding the fact that at the time you wrote this book that you said you had hated violently the word "stool pigeon"——

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, then, how do you account for the fact that after writing those words you volunteered to go out and be a stool pigeon and now you say a lying stool pigeon——

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. How do you account for the fact you did the things——

Mr. MATUSOW. Because these committees, such as this one, of Congress, forced me and many others to do it.

Senator WELKER. We forced you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, by creating a fear, a hysteria in this country which this country has never seen before. The people cannot turn around and talk to neighbors without fear of being called Communists, honest, decent people—you are the one responsible for my role as a witness, not I.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever heard the Senator you are addressing your intemperate remarks to, accusing anyone of being a Communist without ever having the full facts before him—have you?

Mr. MATUSOW. My knowledge of you, sir, and the record of this committee, not to be personal of any Senator—

Senator WELKER. I am asking about the interrogator—and I am proud of this committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. This committee could do a better job if it went to facts.

Senator WELKER. Yes, we can, and when we do experience having a lying witness, Matusow——

Mr. MATUSOW. I can give a list of a number of Matusows.

Senator WELKER. Yes, but we are talking about one Harvey Matusow——

Mr. MATUSOW. A former liar.

Senator WELKER. An admitted liar of every degree and extent.

Mr. MATUSOW. Are you afraid of the truth, sir?

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW Are you afraid of the truth?

Senator WELKER. Tell me one person I have ever called a Communist, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am talking about the witnesses before your committee——

Senator WELKER. I am not afraid of any truth you can give because I don't think there is any truth in your body.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Daniel.

Senator DANIEL. I am just a new member on this committee. I would like to know what member on this committee ever forced you to give any kind of false testimony to this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. Statements made in the public press creating hysteria is what I was referring to.

Senator DANIEL. Will you please answer?

The CHAIRMAN. Answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. There is no member of the committee personally that made me give false testimony. That was not my remark.

Senator DANIEL. Do I understand your answer, no member of the committee forced you to give false testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, but the creation of the committee and activities of the committee would——

Senator DANIEL. In other words, you are not leaving the impression that anyone on this committee either asked you or forced you to give this false testimony to this committee or any other committee of Congress?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I think that should be cleared up.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Because a wrong impression could be gained from what you previously said about that matter.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I agree with you.

Senator DANIEL. Would you like to have your previous remarks concerning forced testimony before the committee stricken from the record?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was forced by public pressure, by the reports of this committee circulated throughout the country, giving people immunity, in which people could attack other people based on lies I told the committee, that is the danger.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am referring to the remark that you just made, a wrong impression could be gained from it about being forced——

Mr. MATUSOW. No member forced me to testify falsely or other wise.

Senator DANIEL. And you would like that remarks stricken from the record, I suppose?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I would appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember having a talk with the ticket agent at Albuquerque?

Mr. MATUSOW. A very vague recollection of such conversation.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember telling him you were going to Taos because somebody there wanted you to write a book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall that; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you say, "If they are crazy enough to pay me, I will write anything"?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you say anything to him that sounded like that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. I doubt it.

The CHAIRMAN. If you said that, you would remember it, would you not, Mr. Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I said, sir, I doubt if I said it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer my question? If you said that, would you remember saying that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Probably, but I don't know, sir——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, did you talk to the ticket agent at Albuquerque?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I had to get a ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. You talked to him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you talk about?

Mr. MATUSOW. Told him I wanted a ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. What else did you tell him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. Might have talked about the weather.

The CHAIRMAN. But did not talk about the book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I referred—one specific part of the conversation was a reference to a story that appeared in the Albuquerque Journal in which there was a quote saying—

Leave the dirty game of politics to little men with little minds—

and that was on the front page of the Albuquerque paper.

The CHAIRMAN. If you referred to that, what did he say?

Mr. MATUSOW. I referred to the quote.

The CHAIRMAN. What did the ticket agent say?

Mr. MATUSOW. He laughed.

The CHAIRMAN. That was, he did not comment, he laughed?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall what he said.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that was in substance all you talked about, just what you recounted?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is all I recall talking about; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you did not state to him that remark about writing——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall any such remark and I doubt it very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, will you state definitely whether you made the statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I doubt very much. I would not categorically admit any statement——

The CHAIRMAN. Answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. I couldn't say definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. I see how you stutter around the perjury, but you are very smart, but be frank with the committee——

Mr. MATUSOW. I say, I don't recall.

The CHAIRMAN. You remember conferring with him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had to get a ticket from him.

The CHAIRMAN. On a number of things, in conversation?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, wouldn't it be the time to make the statement that Mr. Sourwine asked you about?

Mr. MATUSOW. I doubt very much if I made it, and if I did I don't remember it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is still not answering.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know how else——

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make the statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall making the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you testify you did not make such?

Mr. MATUSOW. I testify I don't recall making the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer my question. Will you testify you did not make such statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. The only answer is, I don't recall making that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been pretty well coached.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have been coached only by conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been——

Mr. MATUSOW. You made that statement on television yesterday and you are making it again, and you are wrong.

(Witness consults with counsel.)

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow is conferring with counsel. I wanted to give him an opportunity to do that.

Mr. Matusow, are you aware of the use the Communist Party, through its organizations, its fronts, and its publications, is making of the occasion of your self-accusation?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am aware that members of the Communist Party are pleased, to say the least, about my affidavit in the trial of the 13 Communist leaders and the other admissions I have made.

Mr. SOURWINE. That comes close to answering the question, but the question is whether you know how the Communist Party, through its press and its organizations and the members is using the occasion of your self-accusation.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not a Communist. I have no knowledge of how the Communists are taking this.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you read the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know the Daily Worker of February 24 carried an editorial, Labor Spy Racket, capitalizing upon your statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have seen it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer this for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Mark that as an exhibit.

(The clipping was marked "Exhibit No. 13" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 13

LABOR SPY RACKET

Another day of testimony by Harvey Matusow disclosed that Senator McCarthy himself sent Matusow into Montana and Washington to campaign for the Republican candidates there by pinning the red tag on Senators Mansfield and Jackson, the Democrats endorsed by unions.

As Americans, especially unionists, read the daily disclosures of Harvey Matusow, it becomes evident to them that they have been the victims of the greatest hoax since Hitler used the big lie technique to throw the German people into a disastrous slaughter.

Along with the doings revealed now by Matusow, the informer system has been developed behind the scenes as part of an anti-labor espionage system—a sort of industrial McCarthyism. This has been built to a level that makes the privately operated spy corporations, exposed by the LaFollette committee a generation back, look like small potatoes.

Just as the former agencies grew to become a major roadblock to labor organization in the major industries, so today the new Government-inspired industrial espionage has become a menace that the labor movement can no longer ignore. A growing number of unions whose leaders have been notoriously anti-Communist are now forced to wage a struggle in defense of victims of "loyalty" screening in their own camp.

What began as a program to screen Federal Government employees has now spread to millions in State and municipal employ and to even more millions in industries that have Government contracts or desire to qualify for such contracts.

The people should be aroused to action now, not when spy agencies have a stranglehold on every industrial community in the country. The demand for a real LaFollette-type investigation of the entire informer system and of the role of the Justice Department should be raised everywhere and taken to the Senate Judiciary Committee and its chairman, Senator Harley Kilgore.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know the Daily Worker on the 22d of February carried a story with the headline "Senator Eastland Fails to Shake Matusow Story," in which the lead reads as follows:

Senator James O. Eastland's Internal Security Committee task force today was blocked by a solid wall of candor in its effort to rescue from infamy the witch-hunters' stable of stool pigeons.

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall reading that story.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I offer that for the record?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be received.

(The article was numbered "Exhibit No. 14" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 14

SENATOR EASTLAND FAILS TO SHAKE MATUSOW STORY

(By Abner W. Berry)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 21.—Senator James O. Eastland's Internal Security Committee task force today was blocked by a solid wall of candor in its effort to rescue from infamy the witch-hunters' stable of stool pigeons. The Mississippi Democrat and his aids were able to draw from Witness Harvey Matusow, the 28-year-old former informer who has now recanted his lying testimony, that he was sick of being a tool of Republican front organizations. Matusow, who showed more poise than his interrogators, time after time aroused the crowded hearing room to laughter when the committee members and counsel fell into pits they had prepared for the witness. This was the case when Eastland insisted upon pressing from the witness just who had paid him for attacking people. Matusow answered that he had been paid about $70 for attacking Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, in the 1952 election campaign, and that he had received "twelve or fourteen hundred dollars" for making accusations against Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, during the same campaign.

"I was paid to make those speeches," Matusow declared.

When Eastland insisted upon knowing who had paid the witness, Matusow said he couldn't recall who had paid him in Washington, but he did recall that in Montana he was paid by J. H. Morrow—spelling out the name "Morrow"—who represented a Montana group, For America, described by the witness as "a Republican front organization." The guffaws that had to be rapped down by the chairman's gavel were not at the witness' expense.

At the opening of the hearings Senator Eastland made it clear that it was his purpose to clear from any stigma from recent recantations all those informers whose testimony has been used to smear or convict.

In a 4-page written harangue, Eastland extolled the work of Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers and outdid the courts on the pumpkin papers, stating that some of the documents in Whittaker Chambers' pumpkin contained the handwriting of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White. Followers of both cases were led to believe that the documents in the pumpkin were handwritten. Eastland also tried Owen Lattimore and the Institute of Pacific Relations in his harangue, finding both guilty of being part of the "world Communist conspiracy" which can only be prosecuted with the aid of ex-Communists.

Eastland also rehashed again by citing legal authorities that "conspiracies need not be established by direct evidence of the act charged." The Mississippian described what he called the unbridled fury of the assault on the ex-Communist who is willing to tell what he knows.

Matusow's testimony on this last point punctured Eastland's theory entirely. He said in answers to questions as to how he got in contact with Cameron & Kahn, the publishers of his forthcoming book, False Witness, that it was done through a phone call to Matusow in Dallas. That was last October. Later, Matusow said, he approached the publishers by phone, finally leading to contracts for publication.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that the Daily Worker on the 27th of February carried an editorial, Let's Have the Full Story, which began as follows:

As the Government and witch-hunting con men jump in with frantic efforts to suppress the confession of the repentant informer, Harvey Matusow, new disclosures leak out?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. There are other editorials. The New York Times, the Herald Tribune.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer this for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be received.

(The editorial was marked "Exhibit 15" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 15

LET'S HAVE THE FULL STORY

As the Government and the witch-hunting con men jump in with frantic efforts to suppress the confessions of the repentant informer, Harvey Matusow, new disclosures leak out. And they indicate that only a small fraction of the whole story has been told of the thought-control drive of these past several years, with its security programs, screening out of militant trade unionists, McCarthyite investigations, Smith Act arrests, and other political frameups.

They indicate that the time is long overdue for a real public investigation of the type conducted by the late Senator La Follette during the thirties, which exposed the whole ugly labor spy racket of those days.

But even the labor spy racket, which was rocked to its heels by the La Follette probe, has taken a new lease on life and grown into a business with a $250 million annual take. The subversive-hunting drive whose main instrument is the lying informer, has spilled over into industry, with even the Defense Department admitting that 4,000 security risks have been fired from industry.

As was inevitable, the drive against communism has become translated in industry into a drive against militant union men and women. The last CIO convention expressed alarm over this situation. The CIO United Auto Workers has taken on the case of John Lupa, screened out of an arsenal plant as a security risk. Other unions have begun to speak out. Senator Humphrey,

Democrat, of Minnesota, has scheduled a hearing March 3 on a resolution to establish bipartisan commission to investigate the security program.

There is one flaw, however, in these steps. So far they are still predicated on the proposition that it's O. K. to move against Communists, but that the only thing at issue is the method. This, it is indicated, will be the scope of the Humphrey committee hearing.

But increasingly large numbers of Americans, and especially trade unionists, have begun to learn that a political witch hunt aimed at one group of Americans inevitably threatens the rights of all Americans. The big lie about the menace of communism is what has given rise to the McCarthys, the lying informers, the resurgence of the labor spy racket, the blacklisting of workers. It is time for Americans, and for labor in the first instance, to speak out for an end to this nightmare of witch hunting.

A good first step would be a new La Follette type of investigation into the whole racket of the lying, professional informers. Such an investigation cannot be entrusted to a Senator Humphrey who was denounced even by his own supporters for his hysterical role in jamming through the Communist Control Act in the last Congress, an act which gave a new lease to the informers and the witch hunters. Such an investigation should be conducted by a body such as the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Harley Kilgore, veteran prolabor Senator of West Virginia.

At the same time every case in which these professional informers have been used—the 13 Communist leaders, Clinton Jencks, and others—should be reopened. This is the least that needs to be done if our Bill of Rights is to be rescued from the Brownells and the McCarthys.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow——

Mr. MATUSOW. You are trying to leave an impression here, sir, of something that doesn't exist.

The CHAIRMAN. You answer the questions that are asked you. Make your answers responsive to the questions.

Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. We were concerned with the basic question of your knowledge of how the Communists are using you, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I have no knowledge of how the Communists are attempting to or would be——

Mr. SOURWINE. Having said that, we are now establishing that you did know of some of these things.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have read the Daily Worker and I have read the New York Times. I also read the Congressional Record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, Mr. Matusow, that the Sunday Worker of February 27 had carried a story, the caption of which is: "Others Also Lied, Matusow Tells Snarling Senators."

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I believe I read the story.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 16" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT NO. 16

OTHERS ALSO LIED, MATUSOW TELLS SNARLING SENATORS

(By Abner W. Berry)

WASHINGTON.—In an atmosphere of sterner political morality the klieglighted drama which transpired in room 318 of the Senate Office Building would have set the Government to rocking. Here sat in the witness chair a confident, well-dressed young man who had wrestled with his conscience over lies he had told under oath, lies which had caused some of his victims to be imprisoned and others to become targets for political assassins.

His self-confessed skulduggery, he testified, had been aided by officials of the Department of Justice and Members of the United States Senate. He was treated by the august members of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security,

not as a welcome prodigal back to the realm of truth, but as a national traitor. How dare this Harvey Matusow place his own conscience above the historical blueprint drawn up by his questioners.

But Harvey Matusow, said he had wrestled with the angels of his conscience and he stood toe to toe with the committee members who only a few short months ago would have hailed him as a national hero. There was no hesitation in his answers, even when the questions seemed to place him in a bad light.

By contrast, there was desperation on all levels displayed by those who questioned him. Committee Counsel Jay G. Sourwine set out to establish what he called Matusow's confused state of mind by asking him whether certain passages from Matusow's forthcoming book, False Witness, represented the truth. Was Matusow motivated in giving his false testimony, as the book had it, because of fear, greed, and need?

Without a pause, Matusow answered "Yes," and went on to explain that he was afraid of being arrested and wanted to clear himself from the taint of communism.

Senator James O. Eastland, the Mississippi Democrat, began sniffing something here and wanted to know who Matusow had unjustly attacked for money. The unhesitating answer was Senator (Mike) Mansfield (Democrat, Montana) and Senator Henry M. Jackson (Democrat, Washington). Matusow said he had made radio speeches against both Senators during the 1952 election campaign, accusing them of Communist connections. Under further questioning by Eastland, Matusow remembered that he had received about $700 for attacking Jackson and twelve or fourteen hundred dollars for speaking against Mansfield.

These answers didn't satisfy Eastland; he barked further questions like a hound sniffing the first scent of game; he wanted to know "who paid you?" Matusow couldn't remember who had paid him for attacking Jackson but he recalled that a J. H. Morrow had paid him for his Montana speeches against Mansfield. Morrow, he said, acted for a group called Montana Citizens for America—a Republican-front organization.

Eastland had made it clear in his opening statement as chairman of the subcommittee hearing that his objective was to defend the stool pigeons whose consciences were still untroubled. As the representatives of true Americanism, opposed to that of the present witness, Eastland read some lengthy praises of Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that the Daily Worker of the 27th of February carried a feature story by Marion Bachrach:

"Is This the Twilight of the Informer"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I never saw that story, but it is probably so. I didn't read it in the Daily Worker.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Marion Bachrach is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew her as a Communist.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 17" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 17

IS THIS THE TWILIGHT OF THE INFORMER?

(By Marion Bachrach)

The news of February 15 was much like that on any other day in these strange times: full of good and bad, the one seeming to cancel out the other.

That was the day Senator Margaret Chase Smith (Republican, of Maine) told a Philadelphia audience the end was in sight for the era of the professional demagogs who question the Americanism of anyone who may disagree with them. And she added:

"At long last, the shining truth about the false accusers, the half-truth artists, the professional fabricators, the prevaricators for pay—is beginning to break through the dark and ugly clouds of doubt they have so evilly blown up."

On that day, Harvey Matusow, one of the false accusers, was admitting the

shining truth in the same Foley Square Courthouse where he—and scores of other prevaricators for pay had lied to send innocent men and women to prison, destroy hundreds of reputations, and add thousands of names to the list of those barred from Government or private employment.

It did seem that the dark and ugly clouds smothering America under a smog of intimidation were lifting. And yet—

On that same February 15, in a Chicago courtroom, Claude Lightfoot was sentenced to 5 years in prison—solely on the word of a few professional fabricators, who professed to know what goes on in his head.

On February 15, the rift in the cloud of lies noted by Senator Smith was not yet big enough to let the shining truth open the prison doors, behind which Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Pettis Perry, and their comrades had been placed by the perjured testimony of Harvey Matusow, and others from Roy Cohn's stable of half-truth artists.

Not big enough to free Owen Lattimore from his long ordeal by slander, or to break down the blank wall cutting Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer off from his scientific coworkers—or to clear, once and for all, Dr. Edward U. Condon—or to restore the jobs of thousand of blacklisted workers, teachers, writers, actors, Government employees.

The shining truth about the false accusers was 3½ slow years in catching up with the frameup that sent Eugene Dennis and his comrades of the Communist Party national committee to prison.

Will the shining truth, at long last, overtake the new lies in the making—and save these Communist leaders from the double jeopardy of being tried and convicted again by the lies of the same or new prevaricators for pay?

Is Senator Smith right—is the end of the reign of false accusers really in sight?

Pondering these questions in February 1955, some of us with long memories thought back to February 1937 * * * to the first "preliminary" report of the LaFollette committee, established by the Senate to look into the dirty business of labor espionage and related matters.

That report revealed what subsequent reports, based on years of investigation, would later spell out in great detail, that literally millions of us were caught in a vast espionage net, of whose workings we had only "fragmentary" knowledge. In that February of so long ago the Senate Civil Liberties Committee found that American workers "have learned about spying too late by running afoul of it; they experience its effects without knowing what has happened to them."

Of course, back in those days the labor espionage system was mostly "free private enterprise"—run by the private detective agencies, the big corporations, and the employer associations. Now it has become predominantly a Government enterprise which fosters a host of private auxiliaries.

But our knowledge of how this new and vaster spy system works remains fragmentary. Most of us have "learned about spying too late by running afoul of it." Much of what we learned about the workings of labor espionage in the 1930's has been forgotten, even by the trade unions, and must be learned all over again.

Thanks to the Matusow revelations, we are beginning to relearn the fact once solidly established by the LaFollette committee:

"When the spy is unable to find any information to send in with his report, he can always turn to his imagination."

Harvey Matusow is not the first informer to confess himself an habitual liar. Once it was C. M. "Red" Kuhl who made headlines when he told the LaFollette committee:

"If the client does not seem to think he is receiving enough information, why you go out and get hold of these 'ops' and tell them flat turkey, 'It's your job, too, so maybe you better use your imagination a little and write something * * * of interest to the client.'"

But to relearn that a spy is a spy is a spy * * * no matter against whom he lies * * * is less than enough.

The Providence Journal hit the nail on the head when it called editorially for reexamination of the whole "security" program—from "premise to personnel."

Back in the 1930's we discovered that the espionage system of that day was based on the premise that labor spying could kill the idea of trade-union organization which had seized the minds of millions of workers. We didn't get far in our effort to free ourselves from snoopers until we exposed what the LaFollette committee called, in a chapter of one of its reports, "The pretense that espionage activities are directed against communism."

There came a time in the 1930's when the Senate of the United States unanimously passed a resolution declaring:

"That the so-called industrial spy system breeds fear, suspicion, and animosity, tends to cause strikes and industrial warfare, and is contrary to sound public policy."

But that didn't happen until millions of workers, tearing away the pretense that employers needed espionage to "protect the country from communism," had come to grips with the premise on which the whole evil spy system was based—and built a powerful new trade-union movement.

Was Senator Smith right? Can we really see the end of this sinister "cult of the informer," this era of demagogs who brook no dissent?

The answer depends on all of us, and in the first place on today's powerful labor movement—which owes its very existence to the fact that it once compelled the United States Senate to expose the why as well as the how of labor espionage.

We will surely find many ways to help our fellow Americans speed the day when the shining truth will triumph over all the lies bought and paid for by the Eisenhower administration and the bipartisan witch hunters

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that the Daily Worker of the 25th of February carried a story called A Smith Act Prosecutor Forgets?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the story.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 18" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 18

A SMITH ACT PROSECUTOR FORGETS

(By Harry Raymond)

David L. Marks, who as special assistant to the United States Attorney General was in charge of prosecution of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and her 12 co-defendants in the 1952 trial, yesterday pleaded a lack of memory when questioned by Harry Sacher, attorney for the 13, about pretrial conferences with Harvey Matusow while preparing Matusow's self-confessed false testimony for the Smith Act case.

"I'm not sure," "I don't recall," "I don't remember," were the Marks answers when Sacher asked him to give the substance of secret talks he and his assistants, Roy Cohn, Albert Blinder, Robert Reagan, John Foley, and James Ryan, had with Matusow.

Marks was the first Government witness called by the United States Prosecutor J. Edward Lumbard in the hearing before Judge Edward J. Dimock on a motion for a new trial for the 13.

Sacher quizzed Marks about Matusow's statement that Cohn coached him to fabricate testimony about a conversation he said he had with defendant Alexander Trachtenberg concerning the late Andrei Vishinsky's book, Law and the Soviet State.

Marks said he recalled meeting Matusow secretly in a parked car on the lower East River Drive in December 1951. With him in the car, he said, were FBI Agent J. J. McCarthy, Cohn, Blinder, and Foley. He said Matusow was introduced to him by the agent under the fictitious name John Alden.

Cohn, he added, sat in the front seat with Matusow and was "doing most of the questioning." This coincided with part of Matusow's testimony at the outset of the hearing, Marks said he had difficulty recalling the conversation. He said he did not remember any discussion about Trachtenberg and the Vishinsky book at the East River rendezvous.

"I just can't remember what Mr. Cohn said," Marks told the court, "I can't specifically remember, but it is entirely likely Cohn told Matusow the defendants were indicted for teaching the "advocacy of violent overthrow of the Government'."

Marks told of two long conferences he, Cohn, Reagan, Blinder, and McCarthy had in Lumbard's office in which the Matusow recantations were discussed, and three or four earlier meetings with Lumbard.

Sacher's examination brought the reluctant production by Lumbard of three versions of so-called witness sheets worked up by Cohn and Reagan and used, Matusow had testified, to memorize what he was to say.

Also placed in evidence was a confidential office memo signed by Marks to former United States Attorney Myles Lane, stating he agreed with Cohn that Matusow should be a witness.

The hearing continues today in the Federal courthouse with Cohn and others subpenaed by the Government as witnesses.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, Mr. Matusow, that the Daily People's World of Friday, February 11, carried a story: Notables Back Anti-Informer Petition Drive?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't see the People's World, the paper you are referring to.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 19" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 19

NOTABLES BACK ANTI-INFORMER PETITION DRIVE

LOS ANGELES, February 10.—A petition calling on Attorney General Herbert Brownell to end the use of paid informers and to reexamine all convictions obtained with their help was being circulated throughout Los Angeles today.

The nationally circulated petition was initiated by Elmer A. Benson, former Governor of Minnesota; Reubent W. Borough, California vice chairman of the Independent Progressive Party; D. A. J. Carlson, professor emeritus, University of Chicago.

OTHER SIGNERS

Also Fyke Farmer, Nashville, Tenn., attorney; Rt. Rev. Walter Mitchell, Episcopal bishop (retired), Arizona; Stanley Moffatt, former Los Angeles County judge; Rev. George L. Paine, Episcopal minister, Cambridge; William L. Patterson, national executive secretary, Civil Rights Congress; Willard B. Ransom, Indianapolis attorney; Thomas L. Slater, secretary-treasurer, Carpenters Local No. 1, Chicago; and Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, professor emeritus of Wellesley College, Massachusetts.

The petition is being distributed locally by the Los Angeles Civil Rights Congress, 326 West Third Street.

BLOT ON JUSTICE

More than 100 other ministers, rabbis, lawyers, teachers, and other leaders are listed as cosponsors of the petition, which declares that the use of paid informers "is a blot on justice in this land."

"From the days of Judas," the signers say, "all nations and faiths have stigmatized informers. Yet today the Government of the United States rests what it asserts are efforts to achieve internal security largely on precisely such purchasable individuals.

"Such an atmosphere," says the petition, "can only be disastrous to the moral fabric of this country."

Mr. SOURWINE. This is another article from the Daily People's World, Tuesday, February 8.

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't seen that paper in 4 or 5 years, I guess. I don't believe I could identify or say I have read that.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are just making a speech, Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is clarifying the record, I think.

Mr. SOURWINE (continuing). Stating as follows:

The California Emergency Defense Committee announced today that a leaflet will be off the press this week relating the Harvey Matusow I-lied-for-the-FBI confessions to the frameup nature of the California Smith Act convictions.

I offer that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 20" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 20

CEDC TO PUBLISH LEAFLET ON MATUSOW

SAN FRANCISCO, February 7. The California Emergency Defense Committee announced today that a leaflet will be off the press this week relating the Harvey Matusow I-lied-for-the-FBI confessions to the frameup nature of the California Smith Act convictions.

At the same time CEDC urgently noted that the slow progress of its fighting fund drive was jeopardizing the committee's plans for an intensive campaign for reversal of the California Smith Act convictions.

The fund drive goal is $20,000. Thus far only $9,185 has been turned in, a bare 45 percent of the total. The drive will continue until the goal is achieved. the committee said.

A formal statment added:

"There are big developments in the fight against the repressive Smith Act.

"Here in California a decision might be expected any day from the circuit court of appeals in the case of 14 Californians sentenced to 5-year prison terms under the infamous law. If the decision is negative, then an all-out fight for the right to a hearing before the Supreme Court will be in prospect.

"In New York a hearing is set for March 10 on motions for a new trial in the case of 13 Smith Act victims against whom Matusow admittedly bore false witness.

"All over the country, as a result of the Matusow disclosures, there is a growing feeling that these Smith Act trials were rigged with perjured testimony.

"This is the time to launch a counteroffensive. That is why our drive for the funds to wage the fight is so urgent."

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, Mr. Matusow, that the Daily Worker of February 25 carried a story about the Communist Party telling the President that the Matusow case calls for a probe of Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover?

Mr. MATUSOW. I read that in the New York Times.

Mr. SOURWINE. That doesn't answer my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I read it in the New York Times. Yes, I do know it.

The CHAIRMAN. He asked you if you read it in the Daily Worker.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I read it in the New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. The testimony is you did not read it in the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not read it in the Daily Worker. I read it in the New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be admitted in evidence.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 21" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 21

CP TELLS PRESIDENT: MATUSOW CASE CALLS FOR PROBE OF BROWNELL, HOOVER

The Communist Party yesterday released the text of a letter addressed to President Eisenhower which calls attention to the revelations of false testimony by Government witness Harvey Matusow in "various Smith Act and other thought-control trials." The letter, signed by the party's national chairman, William Z. Foster, places "definite responsibility" for the use of perjured testimony in these cases "upon the heads of the Department of Justice, Mr. Herbert Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover."

The letter follows:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The present scandal over the false testimony of the Government witness Harvey Matusow in various Smith Act and other thought-control trials, shows that these have sunk to the lowest levels of the worst legal frameups in the history of the United States—those of Parsons and Spies, Mooney and Billings, Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro Boys, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, and many others.

Two things have been made clear by the disgraceful situation: The first is that the whole informer-stoolpigeon system, by which large numbers of Communists and other progressive citizens are being railroaded to penitentiaries or deported, is thoroughly rotten and a disgrace to the American people. The whole collection of these professional informers, without exception, are deliberate liars.

This was simply proven during the course of the recent Communist trials, as well as in the other proceedings where these witnesses were used to send innocent men and women to jail.

Matusow, with his shocking stories of coached perjury on the witness stand, is not an exceptional instance of such testimony, but the norm for informer witnesses. All the rest of such witnesses are as guilty as he is.

The second fact made clear by the current perjury exposures is that the professional slanderers have been systematically primed with lies by the prosecutors in charge of the trials in question. This puts a definite responsibility upon the heads of the Department of Justice, Herbert Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover. It is inconceivable that these officials have not been aware of the systematic lying that has been committed by the score or more of the professional informer witnesses, speaking in the name of and with the blessing of United States prosecuting attorneys.

In this situation, four things are indispensable to do in order to at least partially cleanse the Government administration of justice of the foul mess of this organized informer-perjury system.

First, the Communists and others jailed under the testimony of the professional informer witnesses should be promptly released.

Second, all persons victimized through loss of jobs, etc., by reason of testimony at congressional investigations be restored to their jobs.

Third, Mr. Brownell and Mr. Hoover should be immediately suspended from their official functions and a thorough-going Senate Judiciary Committee investigation be made of the gross mismanagement of their offices, including the use of paid informers and the subornation of perjury by Government officials.

Fourth, an end should be put to thought-control trials, which violate every principle of American democracy.

The Government's central charge against the Communist Party, that it teaches and advocates the violent overthrow of the United States Government, is palpably false, as even a cursory study of the program and history of our party shows. The charge can be (and has been) supported in court only on the basis of such flagrant and organized perjury as Matusow has exposed.

The evil must be struck at the root. The near-fascist Taft-Hartley, Smith, McCarran, McCarran-Walter, and Communist Control Acts, and other thought-control legislation must be (and eventually will be) stricken from the statute books. Their basic purpose is to intimidate and persecute all those who dare to speak out against the aggressive prowar policy which your administration is now following.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know independent of what you read in the New York Times——

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir.

(The witness consults with counsel.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you know, independently of what you read in the New York Times, that the national chairman of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, had used the occasion of your self-accusations to address a letter to the President of the United States asking for an investigation of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. MATUSOW. I read that in the New York Times, sir. It was the first time and only time I heard of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, are you familiar with an article which appeared in the Nation entitled "The Informer"?

Mr. MATUSOW. Last April, I believe, or March.

Mr. SOURWINE. I hold in my hand a reprint of this article, dated April 10. Have you seen that before?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you tell us, Mr. Matusow, why this Nation article, The Informer, which excoriates various former Communists who have given testimony against the Communist Party, does not include any mention of Harvey Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it mentions me there, sir. I do not believe I read it that fully.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where does it mention it?

Mr. MATUSOW. If I may have it, I would show it to you.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is quite likely your familiarity with this is greater than that of counsel. I wish you would show the point at which this is mentioned.

Mr. MATUSOW. I think the record should show that this is a reprint of the article that appeared in the Nation magazine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I believe I already stated that.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry; I didn't hear you, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. While you are examining that, Mr. Matusow, let me ask you, did you have anything to do with the publication or preparation of that article?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I did not.

I quote, if I may, from page 10 of that magazine article.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you read where it mentions you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. [Reading:]

> Attempts have therefore been made to intimidate the press through the use of informers' testimony. Harvey Matusow, employed for a time as an investigator by the Ohio Un-American Committee, charged in a political speech in Montana in 1952 that 126 dues-paying Communists were on the Sunday staff of the New York Times—whose entire Sunday staff numbers 93. Matusow went on to say that, "On the editorial and research staffs of Time and Life there are 76 hard-core Reds, and in the New York bureau of the Associated Press there are 25 Communists."
>
> McCarthy later announced that he intended to retain Matusow to investigate Communist infiltration in the press, radio, and television in New York.

That is the end of the quote in the story dealing with me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, can you tell the committee, in view of your familiarity with this document, how it happens that the people who are named in here are the same ones that you have several times sought before this committee to excoriate?

Mr. MATUSOW. You mean the people in that article who are called "informers" and "stool pigeons" are the same ones whom I have been part of and worked with?

Mr. SOURWINE. No; the same ones that you have here several times sought to excoriate.

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Crouch is mentioned there, and he has been caught in lies in testimony. I know him quite well. I belong to the Federation of Former Communists with Mr. Crouch. He has set up an organization of ex-Communists to gather information for these committees.

This is not something I take lightly. I have corresponded with Mr. Crouch, dealing with this Federation of Former Communists. I have met with Mr. Manning Johnson on a number of occasions. I have met Mr. Budenz. I have conversed with these people. Contrary to what Miss Bentley thinks and says, I did have dinner with her on October 3, 1952, and she did cry in her beer and say she did not have new information. She said she did not have any new information. She is a liar and she admitted so in substance that night.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are making another speech.

While you are on the subject, we will follow your lead this far.

Mr. MATUSOW. One other thing, sir.

I will take a lie test with Miss Bentley or anybody else to prove who is telling the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the questions.

Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, will you state to the committee just a single occasion on which, to your knowledge, Elizabeth Bentley lied under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I stated to the committee on the basis of a conversation with Miss Bentley on the evening of October 3, 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. He asked you of your own personal knowledge. Answer his question.

Mr. MATUSOW. My personal knowledge is she did not enumerate the times in which she gave false testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you of your own personal knowledge know of one instance in which Louis Budenz gave false testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think the record is clear in the Lattimore case on the number of occasions he must have given false testimony, and I believe he did.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is: Do you know of your own personal knowledge of one instance in which he did?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't read every word of Mr. Budenz' testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated he gave false testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. I stated I believe he gave false testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Of your own personal knowledge, when did he give such false testimony? Name the incident that was false, to your knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. I personally believe every time Mr. Budenz has testified he has given false testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. When? Every time he has testified.

The CHAIRMAN. Point to one fact on which he swore falsely, to your personal knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. When he denied knowing Owen Lattimore, left it out of his book and magazine pieces that he wrote, and then on the witness stand he said the same thing. I know I lied, and I believe he lied.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of your own personal knowledge that he did?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe he did.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not responsive. You can answer the question "Yes" or "No," and I am ordering you to answer it "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer, I believe, is he did, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of your own knowledge of a single incident where he swore falsely?

Mr. MATUSOW. There were contradictory statements.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer my question "Yes" or "No." Do you know of your own knowledge—then if you answer "Yes" or "No." I have some questions to ask you.

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer will have to be "No," sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then, as a matter of fact, you did not testify that Owen Lattimore was a Communist, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I called him a Communist fronter, or somebody who believed in Communist ideas and whose books carried forth the Communist Party line, and I had no knowledge of any such thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Weren't you careful to testify that only in your own opinion Mr. Lattimore was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I was very careful then.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was he at the time, in your opinion, a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. And Mr. Lattimore denied the charges I made against him under oath at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you know of your own knowledge of one instance in which Paul Crouch lied under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I can come back tomorrow morning and give you a string of instances. I will give you one instance, sir, specifically. In the trial in Philadelphia of Communist leaders——

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you present?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you don't know anything about it of your own knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. The hairsplitting starts again; you are right.

Mr. SOURWINE. The answer is you do not know of your own knowledge of any incident on which Mr. Crouch lied?

Mr. MATUSOW. On the basis of rules of evidence, I do not know of my own knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know perfectly well that you cannot testify.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know Paul Crouch. I know he is a liar.

The CHAIRMAN. You will have to wait until counsel finishes his question. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know quite well, do you not, that you cannot testify concerning a man having lied unless you were present.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know him well enough. I have talked to him enough. I know he is a liar.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is considerably different from your saying that he lied on any particular occasion.

Mr. MATUSOW. If reading the court record in two different proceedings, showing definite contradictory statements by a witness is not of my own knowledge, then I have nothing of my own knowledge. But he has given contradictory statements under oath.

Mr. SOURWINE. So have you.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I admit it, but he doesn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of your own knowledge of any occasion when Manning Johnson told a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe when he accused Dr. Ralph Bunche of being a Communist, that he lied, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether this article, The Informer, by Frank Donner, was a Communist-inspired article?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Mr. Frank J. Donner is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask that this article be made an exhibit, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be entered in the record as an exhibit.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit 22" and will be found in the files of the subcommittee.)

Mr. SOURWINE. You will remember your testimony a few minutes ago about having known Marion Bachrach as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You also testified that you knew certain members of the national executive committee as Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did it happen that an unknown kid knew all these party big-shots?

Mr. MATUSOW. They lectured at Communist Party conventions, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, when did you leave the east coast for Salt Lake City to testify at the hearings of this committee there in 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. I left on the morning of Saturday, October 4. It might have been at noon, it might have been at 10 or 11. I got on United Air Lines plane for Chicago. I left the plane in Chicago, made a speech on Sunday evening in Libertyville, Ill., and on Monday, October 6, I arrived in Salt Lake City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that the speech, the Libertyville speech, in which you have testified you referred inaccurately to Bishop Oxnam?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is the speech in which I inaccurately attacked Bishop Oxnam, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, of the Methodist Church.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, in fact, in this speech say anything at all about Bishop Oxnam?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall mentioning him in that speech.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to know if you will testify that you did?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that I did attack Bishop Oxnam in that speech.

Mr. SOURWINE. If witnesses should appear before this committee who heard that speech and say that you did not, would you continue to testify that you did?

Mr. MATUSOW. If a number of witnesses said I didn't, they might have better recollections than I, but my recollection is still that I attacked Bishop Oxnam in that speech. I attacked Bishop Oxnam and the Methodist Federation of Social Action and a few other Methodist organizations. I remember it quite well.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the speech at Libertyville?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. It was in a Methodist church out there.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was before the Libertyville Sunday Evening Club, was it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, not as evidence of what happened, but as evidence of what has been printed, and for the committee's consideration in deciding whether to call witnesses on this point, I offer for the record the front page of the Independent Register of Libertyville, Ill., for Thursday, February 17, which carries a 2-column head on the left-hand side, "Ex-Red Did Not Mention Bishop in Address Here. Reveal Matusow Did Not Say Oxnam's Name Here." And then it quotes the Reverend A. C. Nesmith, pastor of the First Methodist Church, to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. Admitted in the record.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 23" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 23

EX-RED DID NOT MENTION BISHOP IN ADDRESS HERE

REVEAL MATUSOW DID NOT SAY OXNAM'S NAME HERE

Harvey Matusow, a man who describes himself as a former Communist, and an ex-FBI informer, who says he was encouraged by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (Republican, Wisconsin) to make false statements during the 1952 political campaign, made no reference to Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam in a speech he made in Libertyville October 5, 1952, during which he talked on Communists in the schools, according to Rev. A. C. Nesmith, pastor of the First Methodist Church.

Monday, in New York, it was reported that Matusow told of a meeting with Bishop Oxnam in Washington during which Matusow told the bishop "I want to apologize for a speech I made against you October 5, 1952, in a Methodist Church in Libertyville, Ill."

In that speech Matusow said he had accused the bishop of "supporting Communist fronts."

ENCOURAGED BY JOE

Matusow, testifying Friday at a Federal court hearing on a retrial motion by 12 convicted Communists, said he made "false statements," during the campaign of 3 years ago, and added:

"My manner of presentation and my theme was encouraged by Senator Joseph McCarthy and, in fact, was at the behest of McCarthy and made during the heat of a political campaign."

McCarthy, told in Milwaukee last night of Matusow's testimony, said: "I would have no comment on Matusow at all."

The 12 Communists' appeal for a new trial is based on an affidavit by Matusow that he gave false evidence against them—and with the knowledge of Roy M. Cohn, then an assistant United States attorney at their trial on conspiracy charges.

Cohn, also in Milwaukee Friday night, commented:

"I won't dignify his pack of lies. He (Matusow) has adequately described himself."

Matusow aiso testified Friday he had sent affidavits to the New York Times and to Time magazine saying he had lied in accusing them of having Communists on their staffs.

Matusow was brought to Libertyville by the Sunday Evening Club, a community[1] project sponsored by the Methodist Church. Reverend Nesmith said the club had engaged Matusow through a speakers agency which represented Matusow as a former Communist and an undercover agent of the FBI.

During his speech in Libertyville Matusow said the Protestant Church, the public schools and the Boy Scouts were infiltrated by Communists.

"He made general statements and attacks by inference and inuendo. He did not mention Bishop Oxnam," Reverend Nesmith said.

Matusow received $250 from the Sunday Evening Club for speaking in Libertyville.

The meeting the night Matusow spoke in Libertyville was not well attended. In regards as to how Matusow's speech was taken by those in the audience, Reverend Nesmith said, "Those who wanted to believe did, and those who did not, did not."

At the present time the Department of Justice is checking Matusow's record to find out whether his latest "confession" of making false statements is either more less creditable than his original testimony against Owen Lattimore.

---

[1] This word appeared as "communist" in the original story. In the next issue of the paper (on February 24), this correction was published:

"IT'S 'COMMUNITY,' NOT 'COMMUNIST' PROJECT

"Due to a typographical error, the Sunday Evening Club, an organization which was sponsored by the First Methodist Church of Libertyville but does not exist now was incorrectly identified as a 'Communist' project. It should have been identified as a 'community' project."

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you leave Libertyville to return to Chicago?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I caught a 1 o'clock plane out of Chicago that evening. It would have been early Monday morning, October 6.

Mr. SOURWINE. Wasn't it the 10:10 p. m.?

Mr. MATUSOW. It could have been, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You went back to Chicago? Did you immediately catch a plane to go to Salt Lake City?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. I had a drink with a couple of people in a bar near the airport.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you spend the night in Chicago?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you get back from that trip, back to New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. On election day 1952.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are sure you didn't get back on November first or second?

Mr. MATUSOW. On election day itself.

Mr. SOURWINE. You got back on election day itself?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was it you left Salt Lake City?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forget the exact date. I believe I testified on October 8, 1952, on October 9 or the afternoon of October 8 I got in a car and drove on to Pocatello, Idaho.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have been through that before. I just wanted to get the date.

Mr. MATUSOW. I came back to Salt Lake City on the 14th or 15th. Was there an hour or so and then I went on to Pendleton and Portland, Oreg. and Seattle, Wash., where I met Senator McCarthy. I got caught in a fog and couldn't get back to Salt Lake for a week or so, and went on to New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you board the plane which took you to New York on election day 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. At Las Vegas, Nev., McCarran Field.

Mr. SOURWINE. What date did you board that plane?

Mr. MATUSOW. Midnight of Monday. It was an all night flight.

Mr. SOURWINE. Election day was November 4.

Mr. MATUSOW. Then this was November 3, Monday.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you sure you did not board that airplane on November 1st or 2d?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that it could have been the Monday, the day before election, but that my plane touched down on La Guardia or Idlewild—I believe it was La Guardia Field in New York—touched down on election day at 11 o'clock in the morning. It might have been 10 or it might have been noon.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you sure you didn't arrive in New York on the 1st or 2d of November 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. Quite sure. Before I went to bed that day I voted.

Mr. SOURWINE. In New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I hadn't unpacked.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the day you arrived from Las Vegas by airplane, you voted in New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. Here is the complete chronology. I had filed for an absentee ballot and I took that with me to the polling place.

Mr. SOURWINE. That same evening you telephoned Mr. J. B. Matthews?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it was not in the evening but in the late afternoon.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of election day?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, about 3 or 4 in the afternoon.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was the party at Mrs. Bentley's home in Washington?

Mr. MATUSOW. Election day night.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was the same evening?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, sir. You have testified concerning an occasion on which you said you had dinner with Elizabeth Bentley. That was the third of October 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, it was. It was a Friday.

Mr. SOURWINE. You stated where you had that dinner?

Mr. MATUSOW. At the Rochambeau Restaurant on 11th Street in New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was anybody else present at the table with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have dinner with Elizabeth Bentley on another occasion?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had luncheon with her on another occasion when she also cried.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was after the first meeting. The luncheon meeting was in midtown New York. I don't recall the name of the restaurant. Also present was Mrs. Ruth Matthews, the wife of J. B. Matthews, Miss Bentley, and myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever have dinner with Elizabeth Bentley on another occasion?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you have dinner on November 16, 1952, at the home of J. B. Matthews?

Mr. MATUSOW. That could have been possible. I couldn't recall that. I have had dinner with J. B. Matthews and a lot of other people.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you regard Miss Elizabeth Bentley as one of the most important of the ex-Communists who have given testimony to the Government about the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. One of the most unstable.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer his question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't regard her as important. I regard her as an important liar, not in any other way.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not think her testimony has been important with respect to the Communist Party conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. It has helped create a lot of unfounded hysteria in this country. It has hurt a lot of people.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom has it hurt?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think her testimony has hurt the Constitution of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. You said her testimony has hurt a lot of people.

Mr. MATUSOW. It has hurt the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are those people whom it has hurt?

Mr. MATUSOW. You are one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else?

Mr. MATUSOW. Every member of this committee and every citizen of this country. I am sorry, but I don't know the names of them all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow——

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, Miss Bentley, if I may continue, Mr. Chairman—what else do I know about Miss Bentley?

Mr. SOURWINE. Nobody asked you that.

Mr. MATUSOW. I can give you one fact that you can check and find very substantially will back up this story. If the committee wants the facts, you should ask me about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Volunteer your information.

Mr. MATUSOW. In March 1952 Miss Bentley was due to testify before the Subversive Activities Control Board here in Washington. The date in fact was the day I took the stand. She was supposed to have been the witness. The Justice Department attorneys presented to the Board and to the other attorneys a letter from Miss Bentley's doctor saying she was not physically capable. As it so happens, she was not in an emotional state of mind, ready or able to testify in that proceeding. That state of mind continued with Miss Bentley until after she went to work as a teacher in Louisiana. I believe that is where she is teaching. During this period she continuously cried and threatened people, saying, "You either give me a full-time job, or I am not going to testify any more. I don't have any new information."

She was pretty upset and very unstable, more so than I was at the time. The Government knew about it, when the Government did not put her on the stand in the case of the Communist Party before the Subversive Activities Control Board in March 1952.

The Government had a letter from her doctor stating that.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your point?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Government should have known better than to use her or to use her since then. She made statements about Mr. White, which may or may not have been true, but after this period, when the Government knew she was unstable, and her doctor said she was not qualified to be a witness in March 1952. The galley proofs of her book and the manuscript of her book have many, many facts in it which are not the same, many obviously which her publisher said, "You must take out of the book because they are not things you can prove, and they are not true."

In one thing, in the galleys of her book—and this has been reported publicly——

Senator DANIEL. Is he testifying of his own knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am testifying as to the medical certificate that was given to the Government, of my own knowledge.

Senator DANIEL. As to what the publisher told Miss Bentley?

Mr. MATUSOW. You wanted the facts.

Senator DANIEL. I ask you if that was of your own knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. My own knowledge of the difference between the galleys and the final version of her book? I think the committee should investigate that to find the facts.

Senator DANIEL. Are you testifying of your own knowledge about the publisher telling her what to take out of her book?

Mr. MATUSOW. The difference between the galleys and the final book show that much was taken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know from my own knowledge. I know of the difference between the galleys and the final version of the book. That is the point the committee ought to investigate in relation to Miss Bentley.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, are you telling the committee that a person who has at any time had crying jags and a medical certificate that at that time he or she was unfit to testify, should never have his word accepted for any purpose: is that your view?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said—and I should say now, if it wasn't clear before—that a person who was under a doctor's care, emotionally unstable, who said, "I will not be a witness unless I am paid for being a witness," who said, "I have to get new information in order to make a living," a person who makes those statements should be screened a little more thoroughly than Miss Bentley was screened.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was it that Miss Bentley told she would not testify unless she was paid?

Mr. MATUSOW. She told me that.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else did she tell——

Mr. MATUSOW. I think——

The CHAIRMAN. You are charging something against the Government attorneys. Do you mean to say she told the Government attorneys——

Mr. MATUSOW. She told me she told two FBI agents who visited her in her Connecticut home.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you, sir, about the Government attorneys who prepared the affidavit. You have testified that she told them that she would not testify unless she was paid.

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say that. The record doesn't read that way. The record does not read that way.

Senator WELKER. You have stated that you believe that Miss Bentley should never have her word accepted.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right.

Senator WELKER. Under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you want to tell the committee that this committee or any other committee or any other tribunal should never accept your word under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Anybody who goes before a committee and is making a living at being a witness is somebody I would doubt. I have been that type of witness. Miss Bentley has been that type, and is that type, of witness. That is what I am saying, sir.

Sentor WELKER. You once made your living doing that.

Mr. MATUSOW. I admit that, sir. That is why I am here now to try to undo some of the harm.

Senator WELKER. The question is when and where were you lying? Would you ask any tribunal, any congressional committee, or anyone else to ever accept your word under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am asking you to accept my word now, because it is the truth. It is not motivated by money, fear, greed, or need, but by truth and conscience.

Senator WELKER. We will go into that matter about the money, fear, greed, and need. I remember your words in your book. I will take you on a little later on that.

Mr. MATUSOW. Glad to.

Mr. SOURWINE. You testified that Miss Bentley was broke and she could not get employment of any kind?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Despite everything she had done for her country?

Mr. MATUSOW. A few weeks after——

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have been closely bordering on contempt many times in your aggressive attitude toward the committee and your interruption of questions. Try to restrain yourself.

That was true, in spite of everything she had done for her country in exposing the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know how much she has done for her country.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, on the basis of your testimony about Miss Bentley's financial condition, would you say that the journalists and radio commentators and others who have given currency to the charge that ex-Communists who have exposed communism have done so from motives of personal greed might be wrong about that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think the ex-Communists, most of the ex-Communists have done so for motives of personal greed or fear.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that they could wind up broke like Miss Bentley?

Mr. MATUSOW. Miss Bentley said she bought a home and paid so many thousands of dollars for a brand-new home up in Connecticut with the proceeds of a book she wrote, a so-called expose of communism. She didn't have to buy a home. She spent her money on a home and couldn't get another job.

Senator WELKER. May I have a question on the subject matter counsel is interrogating about, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator WELKER. With respect to the words "fear, greed and need," directing your attention, Mr. Witness, to page 126, the chapter 10, under the subtitle, a "Law Named Smith," second paragraph:

> I ask myself, as many of you might ask, how could I believe one thing so strongly and then turn completely around? The answer can be summed up for me in three words—fear, greed and need.

Now, would you like to describe and discuss that to the committee, please? Fear, greed and need.

Mr. MATUSOW. Gladly, sir.

Senator WELKER. That you used just a moment ago. I told you I would come back to it.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Is that the same reason why you have abused Miss Bentley here; fear, greed and need?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think she has lived under the fear, greed and need; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You admit you did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I think most ex-Communist witnesses have and do.

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe most ex-Communist professional witnesses are motivated basically by fear, greed and need.

Senator WELKER. Who do you fear?

Mr. MATUSOW. These committees.

Senator WELKER. You fear the committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did at one time.

Senator WELKER. Did anybody ever go out and handcuff you and ask you to come in before us?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think a lot of people have been intimidated.

Senator WELKER. I am asking about you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nobody ever handcuffed me. I don't fear the committee now.

Senator WELKER. You came voluntarily?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. What was the greed?

Mr. MATUSOW. I found I could make an easy living, and other witnesses found they could make an easy living.

Senator WELKER. You made an easy living?

Mr. MATUSOW. Of course, sir.

Senator WELKER. In 1952 your living wasn't so easy. You were broke when you went to Wisconsin?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was extremely good in 1952.

Senator WELKER. I read some place in your book—and I will find that—wherein you asked——

Mr. MATUSOW. I have been broke on a number of occasions.

Senator WELKER. There is no question about that. You were telling me how easy it was to make a living.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sure it was.

Senator WELKER. In 1952 in the State of Wisconsin you had to ask for $300; am I right or wrong?

Mr. MATUSOW. I asked for the money that was to be paid me for campaigning in Wisconsin, yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. That was the——

Mr. MATUSOW. $350, I believe, is the official figure.

Senator WELKER. I understood it was three.

Mr. MATUSOW. The State of Wisconsin has just come out and said $350.

Senator WELKER. I am not talking about greed in terms of $50.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. What is your description of need?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, if you want to go into that, we can. The question of trying to get along in this world when you have been a Communist, and having to go all the way over to the extreme right politically and attack other Communists, rather than dropping out of the Communist Party.

The need of self, shall we say, self-respect in a society, in a country where you can only have self-respect if you inform on your neighbors and your friends.

Senator WELKER. That word which you hated so viciously at one time, informer and stool pigeon?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Could it have anything to do with the word "need" for writing a book, from which you could receive some profit?

Mr. MATUSOW. I stated the other day—and I state it again—that the proceeds from this book will go to charity, sir.

Senator WELKER. I don't care what you stated before. I want to hear your statement now.

Mr. MATUSOW. I state it again now.

Senator WELKER. Could need have anything to do at all with your having somebody publish a book called The False Witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that you knew or ought to have known that one of the labor unions that you maligned in your so-called false testimony had purchased thousands of copies of this so-called book in advance?

Mr. MATUSOW. I found out after the book was written that this union had purchased thousands of copies.

Senator WELKER. You made no objection to that?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You knew also, did you not, that this so-called book was to go beyond the Iron Curtain in many countries?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know that, sir.

Senator WELKER. And to other labor unions that you now say you maligned when you testified under oath in my neighboring State, the State of Utah, the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. You know that, don't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you realize that they, too, bought some thousands of copies of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is the only union I know that bought thousands of volumes. You are telling me something I didn't know, if there is any other union.

Senator WELKER. Isn't it true? Did you inquire of Mr. Kahn or Mr. Cameron?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Or the—I don't know how to describe him, whether he is your bodyguard or your aide.

Mr. MATUSOW. Just a friend.

Senator WELKER. A friend that you have known less than a month?

Mr. MATUSOW. A friend nevertheless.

Senator WELKER. While we are on this subject of fear, greed and need, when did you last work for a living?

Mr. MATUSOW. As late as October of 1954 until I started writing this book.

Senator WELKER. October of 1954?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. When was the last time you accepted any money from the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I was a member of the Communist Party.

Senator WELKER. When was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1950.

Senator WELKER. And that was only for expenses?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You received no salary whatsoever?

Mr. MATUSOW. None whatsoever.

Senator WELKER. What was your income from, other than your expenses there?

Mr. MATUSOW. At that time?
Senator WELKER. Yes.
Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I drove a taxicab for a while.
Senator WELKER. How many days, and where?
Mr. MATUSOW. A week or so in Albuquerque. I went to school under the GI bill of rights in Taos.
Senator WELKER. You didn't save any money on that, did you?
Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.
Senator WELKER. You didn't drive a taxicab for a couple of weeks in Albuquerque?
Mr. MATUSOW. It might have been 10 days or 2 weeks, just about.
Senator WELKER. I think that is where you testified you did a little bootlegging.
Mr. MATUSOW. Sold bootleg whisky after 2 in the morning, after the bars were closed.
Senator WELKER. Did you save any money as a result of that job?
Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.
Senator WELKER. Give the time and date of that, please.
Mr. MATUSOW. That was in January–February 1951.
Senator WELKER. Your next gainful employment?
Mr. MATUSOW. United States Air Force.
Senator WELKER. When was that?
Mr. MATUSOW. 1951, from February to December.
Senator WELKER. That terminated when?
Mr. MATUSOW. December.
Senator WELKER. Did you have any savings at the time?
Mr. MATUSOW. I did.
Senator WELKER. You did?
Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.
Senator WELKER. How much?
Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall offhand, maybe a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars.
Senator WELKER. That was in 1951?
Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.
Senator WELKER. Where did you get that money?
Mr. MATUSOW. I worked after hours at the airbase.
Senator WELKER. Doing what?
Mr. MATUSOW. With the permission of the PX officer down at Brooks, I set up for altering uniforms, sewing on chevrons for NCO's. It was part of the PX setup. When I went to Dayton——
Senator WELKER. Let's stay down here. I want to get that. Where was it set up and what did you do?
Mr. MATUSOW. Somebody else had set it up, and I took it over when this fellow went overseas.
Senator WELKER. How much an hour did they pay you for that?
Mr. MATUSOW. Nobody paid me by the hour. It was off duty, at night. If there were 10 guys wanting chevrons sewn on their uniform, I had that done for them.
Senator WELKER. How much money did you make out of the 10 guys?
Mr. MATUSOW. Two bits a chevron.
Senator WELKER. $2.50.
Mr. MATUSOW. Part of if went to the company fund.

Senator WELKER. Do you now want the committee to understand when you got out of the Air Force in December 1951 you had about $1,000?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the figure. It might have been a thousand dollars.

Senator WELKER. Did you have it in a bank?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. I sent some of it to my parents. I send it to them whenever I can, to help them.

Senator WELKER. Did you send it in a money order?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall how I sent it. I might have given it to them on leave.

Senator WELKER. Then what was your next gainful employment?

Mr. MATUSOW. Investigator for the Ohio un-American activities investigation.

Senator WELKER. How long did you stay there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Three months.

Senator WELKER. How much did you make there?

Mr. MATUSOW. $300 a month, plus expenses.

Senator WELKER. You set that out in your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe so.

Senator WELKER. How much were you able to save out of living in Columbus?

Mr. MATUSOW. I lived in Dayton.

Senator WELKER. I beg your pardon. You are correct.

How much were you able to save out of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. When did you terminate that employment in Dayton?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it was in April.

Senator WELKER. What year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1952.

Senator WELKER. And where did you next work?

Mr. MATUSOW. Did free-lance radio writing and stuff. Did two shows, an experimental show called Out of the Red, on station WING.

Senator WELKER. How much did you make out of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. $50.

Senator WELKER. For 2 nights' work?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Did you save that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. But you still had this thousand dollars as a nest egg at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not necessarily, sir.

Senator WELKER. Can you tell me how much money you did have when you left Dayton?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember. Maybe two, three, four hundred; maybe five hundred.

Senator WELKER. That is a broad spread.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I don't remember how much money I had in my hand on a specific day.

Senator WELKER. When were you next employed?

Mr. MATUSOW. By a magazine called Counterattack.

Senator WELKER. There you sold subscriptions, and you got $9 out of every $24 sold?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was also assistant to the editor.

Senator WELKER. Prior to becoming that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I sold the subscriptions for Counterattack at $9 a subscription while I was an investigator for the Ohio un-American activities.

Senator WELKER. How much did you make out of that $9 out of every $24 of subscriptions?

Mr. MATUSOW. $9 out of every $24.

Senator WELKER. How much total?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, you made very little?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not much. It was a nominal fee.

Senator WELKER. You got a percentage on a magazine subscription?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And they didn't sell very readily, as I recall?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. How much did you receive while you were assistant editor?

Mr. MATUSOW. $70 to $80 a week, plus——

Senator WELKER. And you were living, I believe, in a cold-water flat in New York; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. The first apartment I had was sublet from Robert Morris, who was then counsel for this committee. I lived on 73d Street.

Senator WELKER. How much did you pay for that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. Then I moved into a cold-water flat in Greenwich Village and fixed an apartment up.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall how much money, at all, you saved out of your salary from Counterattack?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall how much spent for food, or anything?

Mr. MATUSOW. I usually spent a lot of money. I used to.

Senator WELKER. You do recall that in the fall of 1952, according to your own book, you were flat broke, and you had to ask for money in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I was flat broke in the fall of 1952; quite the reverse. I was living it up pretty good in the fall of 1952.

Senator WELKER. In other words, eating high on the hog?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. If I remember correctly.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I was flying around in chartered airplanes.

Senator WELKER. I don't think you did. I believe the committee did.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I did on 2 or 3 occasions.

Senator WELKER. Did you pay for it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Somebody else paid for it. It was put at my disposal. That is living pretty high.

Senator WELKER. With somebody else paying for it.

Mr. MATUSOW. What difference does it make if the money was paid by somebody else or came out of my pocket? I was doing the heavy living.

Senator WELKER. What else did you do in 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. I made some money to escort a witness out of the jurisdiction of the Hennings committee, take her out of the country to Nassau, so she wouldn't have to testify about McCarthy.

Senator WELKER. How much did you get from the Hennings committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't get anything from the Hennings committee.

Senator WELKER. Who was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Arvilla P. Bentley. The witness paid me.

Senator WELKER. How much did she pay you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had a nice vacation in the Bahamas.

Senator WELKER. I am asking you how much money she paid you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will break it down for you. About a thousand dollars hotel bill that she paid for, $300 set of golf clubs that she bought me, plus maybe three or four or five hundred dollars for 2 weeks' work.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall how much folding money you got?

Mr. MATUSOW. Four or five hundred dollars.

Senator WELKER. It could have been $150?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was higher than that, I can assure you.

Senator WELKER. $250?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was closer to four.

Senator WELKER. Your first answer was $250.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it was closer to 400.

Senator WELKER. Where is Mrs. Bentley now?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Senator WELKER. How did she pay you? In cash or by check?

Mr. MATUSOW. Paid me in cash.

Senator WELKER. Did you later become married to her?

Mr. MATUSOW. On two occasions.

Senator WELKER. You were married to her when she paid you the money?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. How much net money did you save as a result of that trip out of the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir, because a couple of days after I got back I went to Texas to do a job for the Texas Pacific Railroad, before a Labor Relations Board. They paid me $800 for 24 hours' work. That included transportation, which came to about 250.

Senator WELKER. How much money do you have now?

Mr. MATUSOW. In my pocket?

Senator WELKER. No; your total assets.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. A couple or three hundred dollars, maybe.

Senator WELKER. Where did you get that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Earned it.

Senator WELKER. From whom?

Mr. MATUSOW. Partly in night-club work I have done since October 1952.

Senator WELKER. Night-club work?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I do night-club work.

Senator WELKER. Was that as an actor?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. What sort of act do you put on?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, at one point I satirized the Army-McCarthy hearings. I would do the voices of the various characters in that proceeding as if it were a baseball game.

Senator WELKER. After your acting experience, what else did you do?

Mr. MATUSOW. I made money at that. That is how I do it.

Senator WELKER. When was the last time you appeared in a night club?

Mr. MATUSOW. A room called the Salle de Champion on Macdougal Street.

Senator WELKER. When?

Mr. MATUSOW. Six to seven weeks ago.

Senator WELKER. How long did you appear there?

Mr. MATUSOW. For about a week.

Senator WELKER. How much did you receive for that week?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the exact amount. I have done independent club dates, birthday parties for children.

Senator WELKER. With the wonderful memory you have on things you want to remember, you cannot tell us how much you received for appearing in a famous night club in New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is not a famous club. It is just a night club.

Senator WELKER. I would remember it if I had appeared for a week in a night club.

Mr. MATUSOW. I keep a record of it. I have other things on my mind.

Senator WELKER. How much have you received from the publishers of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Since October I have received approximately $1,500, at the rate of about $50 a week in advance on this book.

Senator WELKER. And you tell me now you have $300?

Mr. MATUSOW. Approximately. It might be $250.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that they have been paying your expenses since that time? You are down to $300?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I have a few debts that I incurred when I was living high up on the hog, as you phrased it, and when I get a few extra dollars, I will try to pay those debts off.

Senator WELKER. That is about all at this time.

Senator HENNINGS. I don't know whether I understood you to say that you did or did not receive any money from a committee of which I happened to have been chairman in 1952.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. The answer was I received money from somebody who was supposed to have been a witness before your committee, to take her out of the jurisdiction of the committee.

Senator HENNINGS. Is that the Committee on Privileges and Elections?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. And you were paid to take a witness, subpenaed by our committee, out of the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe the witness had been subpenaed, but one of your investigators, or the committee's investigators, had attempted to get service upon that witness, and I believe the attorney for the witness said that the witness would be available in a day or

so, and the committee member took the attorney at his word. That was the day before Thanksgiving 1952. However, on Thanksgiving Day the witness left Washington, and I accompanied the witness, under the witness' maiden name.

Senator HENNINGS. Who was that witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. Arvilla Peterson Bentley.

Senator HENNINGS. Who was the lawyer who made the arrangement for you to take the witness out of the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. He knew about it. He didn't make any arrangements for it. Arrangements were made by Dr. J. B. Matthews.

Senator HENNINGS. For you to transport the witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. To accompany the witness.

Senator HENNINGS. From the United States to where?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nassau, in the British Bahamas.

Senator HENNINGS. There is just one thing, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Senator HENNINGS. I don't want to unnecessarily interfere with Mr. Sourwine's investigation. I understood you to say something about this being a country where you could only have self-respect if you bore witness against another?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was the way I felt when I became a witness. I felt that by just dropping out of the Communist Party and maybe reporting to the FBI, but never testifying, it would be sufficient because my neighbors and other people still accused me——or I believed would have accused me, as the Air Force did—of being a Communist, and it was not sufficient to furnish objective facts to the FBI. But I felt—and other witnesses who talked to me felt— that same way, that they must get up publicly and cleanse their souls, so to speak, and denounce other people, for people in their communities to begin to accept them once again.

Senator HENNINGS. I was somewhat intrigued—I don't know if my colleagues on this committee who were on it last year may or may not have heard of the Federation of Former Communists. I had never heard of that organization, Mr. Matusow.

That federation, is it incorporated under any pro forma decrees of any State?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it is incorporated here in the District of Columbia, and my recollection is that Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin, former Congressman Kersten, introduced in the record of the Congressional Record statements about this Federation of Former Communists, and the fact that it had been incorporated, and at one time I was a member of the committee, the national committee, or executive body—I forget which.

Senator HENNINGS. And you have chapters of this federation in various cities?

Mr. MATUSOW. There were attempts made to set up chapters of this Federation of Former Communists.

Senator HENNINGS. Do you know who the president of that organization is?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Paul Crouch, as far as I knew, conceived the idea, and he was the leader of it, and I have had correspondence with him. I will endeavor to locate such correspondence, if you would like, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. I think it might be very interesting, and possibly very illuminating.

Mr. MATUSOW. May I forward it to your office, or to the committee?

Senator HENNINGS. To the committee, if you please, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will attempt to do that.

Senator HENNINGS. Have you ever paid dues to that Federation of Former Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have given a financial contribution to the Federation of Former Communists; yes, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. Do you remember to whom you gave the payment you say you made?

Mr. MATUSOW. To Mr. Paul Crouch. It was sent by mail. I have a letter showing he received it.

Senator HENNINGS. Have you been to meetings of this organization or any of its branches anywhere in the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have discussed it in the form of an informal meeting at his home in Washington.

Senator HENNINGS. But you have never been at any meetings of the so-called Federation of Former Communists, as such?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. You just understand, I assume, that such an organization exists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have correspondence to that effect.

Senator HENNINGS. Or that they are trying to start one?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was under the impression that that charter or incorporation certificate had already been gotten.

Senator HENNINGS. Under some pro forma decree, you believe?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. Or some other such legal device.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Senator WELKER. Are you married now?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Are you divorced now?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. When did you become divorced?

Mr. MATUSOW. First time, on August 25, 1953, and again on September 28, 1953, both divorces obtained in Reno, Nev. The first one in the first district court, and the second in the second district court.

Senator WELKER. Did you appear there?

Mr. MATUSOW. I signed a waiver.

Senator WELKER. Do you know where your wife is at this time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Senator WELKER. You don't know whether she is in the United States, or in Nassau, or Panama?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir.

Senator WELKER. Haven't heard from her since the divorce?

Mr. MATUSOW. I saw her once; spoke to her once, briefly. That was all. That was a year or a year and a half ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you remember testifying in court concerning your conference at the Delmonico Hotel with Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. You are referring to Judge Dimock's court?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall some testimony on that subject.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall testifying that you told them:

I have seven criticisms of the Communist Party, but this is not what I intended to deal with in this book. I wanted to deal with my activities after I left the Communist Party.

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance. I might have said that, but that is the substance of my remarks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, why did you think it important to tell Cameron & Kahn that your book would not deal with any criticisms of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I said the book would not have any criticisms of the Communist Party. I said I believed the main subject of the book would be the activities engaged in after leaving the Communist Party, because I felt that enough people had written books about what the Communist Party was like, and I felt it was time that somebody wrote a book to say what the anti-Communist right wing movement was like in this country, not in a pro- or anti-Communist way.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what you testified to in court?

Mr. MATUSOW. They were prospective publishers at the time of my book, and I felt the main concern that I had——

The CHAIRMAN. You have answered the question.

(Senator Hennings left the hearing room.)

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe it is fully answered.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, it is. Just a minute.

Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your testimony was, Mr. Matusow:

I showed them that report and told them that I am not writing this book in the sense that it is pro-Communist or anti-Communist, and that I have certain criticisms of the Communist Party, but this is not what I intended to deal with in this book. I want to deal with my activities after I left the Communist Party. At this meeting I didn't say I gave false testimony in those words, as I said Friday, I had an obsession about the term "lie." I wouldn't use it. I talked in general about the testimony and I said specifically to them that in the book I am not doing it to be used by anybody. If the Communist Party uses it, it is not because it was written as a pro-Communist document, because I am not pro-Communist, but rather I am going to tell the truth in this book, and if anybody can use the truth, they are welcome to it.

Why did you think, Mr. Matusow, that the Communist Party would use your book if Cameron & Kahn published it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I felt they would use any book, regardless of who published it, because I had things to say about my bearing false witness against Communist Party leaders.

To complete the answer, if the book had been published by Simon & Schuster or Doubleday, or one of the so-called legitimate publishing houses, I am certain the Communist Party could make greater use of my book than the fact that it was published by Cameron & Kahn, whom this committee and the press have accused of being pro-Communist, or left-wing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you give us the names of all individuals about whom you know, who aided in research for or supplied any material for your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I can do that very briefly. You, sir, are one person, because I have a document signed by you. The committees and the reports before these committees have also furnished me with

information through the publication of such reports. The letters I have received from various people, Members of the Senate, House of Representatives, from staff members of certain committees, have aided me in the research and development of this book. Mr. Kahn at one time helped, because I asked him to get transcripts of certain testimony which I had given, which I didn't have.

A Miss Janice, who took the dictation, helped in the fact that she took the dictation. I don't believe Mr. Cameron helped in any way. I believe Mr. Witt told me, after reading the copy of the chapter on the Salt Lake City hearings, that it was not a national convention of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Union, but a legislative conference, or some such thing. And certain newspapers which published reports about my activities in the past, such as the New York Times and the Tribune, the newspapers in Idaho, in Pocatello, in Idaho Falls, the Salt Lake City newspapers, the El Paso newspapers, the Washington, D. C. newspapers, have helped me in research.

I have used that material. And on that subject, sir, I believe I said the other day I would bring in the proofed copies of the documentation in the book, if the committee wants them. I have them here. I believe that is partly in answer to your question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, haven't you confused the material you used with my question about individuals who supplied material for your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Individuals are Mr. Kahn, who obtained for me the transcript, certain members of the United States Senate, who have written me letters which I reproduced in my book. Staff investigators for a senatorial committee who have corresponded with me. Correspondence from members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Air Force of the United States in issuing an order to me, putting me on temporary duty with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, plus their published reports. These are the places that furnished me with material which I used. Nobody furnished it to me other than the people who corresponded with me.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Some people did furnish you material for your book, knowing what it was for?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Kahn did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was he the only one?

(Senator Daniel left the room at this point.)

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe a friend of mine, an assistant to the editor of the New York Post at one time furnished me with a copy of a newspaper article which had appeared in the New York Post, that I asked him to get for me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. His name was Duffty. I believe Mr. Drew Pearson, upon my request, furnished me with photostatic copies of certain notes written to me by Arvilla Bentley during the trip to Nassau. That is something I just remembered, specifically because I wanted to use it in my book. I believe I asked Mr. Carey McWilliams of the Nation magazine to furnish me with a copy of that article entitled "The Informer" prior to my writing the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is——

Mr. MATUSOW. For the purpose of writing the book.
Mr. SOURWINE. What is Mr. Duffty's full name?
Mr. MATUSOW. Bill.
Mr. SOURWINE. Are there any other persons?
Mr. MATUSOW. None that I can recall at this time, sir.
Mr. SOURWINE. What were the terms of sale of your book?
Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't hear that, sir.
Mr. SOURWINE. What were the terms of sale of your book?
Mr. MATUSOW. Sale to the public, or sale to the publisher?
Mr. SOURWINE. Your sale to the publisher.
Mr. MATUSOW. The original terms, to the best of my recollection, and if I saw the contract I think I could be more explicit—I believe were to receive $250 cash advance. It was added up to a total of $350; $100 was part of the airline ticket I was sent, making a $350 total. I believe for 12 weeks $50 a week, but our agreement was that in the event, at the end of that period, I needed a few additional dollars, maybe three or four hundred dollars, provided I had agreed to the terms of the contract and furnished enough of the book, I would get an additional advance at $50 a week for X number of weeks.
Mr. SOURWINE. When did you sign the formal contract with your publisher?
Mr. MATUSOW. The letter of agreement of October 26, 1954.
Mr. SOURWINE. Was that before or after you had filed the affidavit in which you stated that you perjured yourself in the trial of the 13 Communists?
Mr. MATUSOW. Prior to filing any affidavit where I stated I gave false testimony.
Mr. SOURWINE. Did you thereafter sign a second contract with Cameron & Kahn?
Mr. MATUSOW. I thereafter signed another contract, by supplemental agreement.
Mr. SOURWINE. Which was more favorable to you than the first one?
Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; it was not.
Mr. SOURWINE. It called for more money, didn't it?
Mr. MATUSOW. Not necessarily. I gave up certain rights which I had retained.
Mr. SOURWINE. It called for more money, didn't it?
Mr. MATUSOW. It did not. There is a percentage there. But the price of the book had been reduced considerably from the original intent of the price of the book, which meant the royalty which I was to receive per copy was considerably lower. It was then balanced out by a slightly higher royalty, but in the second contract I gave up certain rights which I had retained previously.
Mr. SOURWINE. It called for more money, didn't it?
Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so.
Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't it call for a larger amount as a down payment on the book, $600 more than the first contract?
Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. It might be in there.
Mr. SOURWINE. You know it did.
Mr. MATUSOW. I don't. I take your word for it.
Mr. SOURWINE. From $900 to $1,500; isn't that right?
Mr. MATUSOW. Probably.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't it call for a higher rate of royalty on the hard-backed copies?

Mr. MATUSOW. It called for a higher rate of royalty with a lower book rate. The book was originally scheduled for $5.

Mr. SOURWINE. Neither contract specified the sale price of the book, did it?

Mr. MATUSOW. It said a minimum price, but Cameron and Kahn and I had an agreement about the price of the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Both contracts specified the same minimum, did they not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't the second contract call for a higher percentage, a better percentage?

Mr. MATUSOW. A higher percentage on a lower book price. That was our agreement.

Mr. SOURWINE. They both specified the same minimum book price?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am telling you what the agreement was, and not what you read in the contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you telling us that this contract is not your agreement with Cameron & Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is our agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is the contract? Do you have a copy?

Mr. SOURWINE. The contract is in our records.

All right, sir, I will leave that point. Was the final contract, Mr. Matusow, the contract which the record will show was either better, or not better than the first contract; was that final contract signed before or after you offered your affidavit in the Federal court recanting your testimony against some of the 13 second-string Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. The supplemental contract was signed after my signing of the affidavit, for good reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the reason?

Mr. MATUSOW. The contract was agreed to prior to that, but Mr. Cameron had been in the Adirondacks with his sick wife, and could not come to New York, and we were unable to get his signature on the contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. So you knew before you signed the affidavits you were going to get a better contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew I was going to get a supplemental contract. As I stated, it is not a better contract, it is basically the same contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was decided before you signed the affidavits?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was decided before I finished the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew you were going to get the other supplemental contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had the contract all along.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't get it until after you signed the affidavits, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because Mr. Cameron was unavailable to finish drawing up the contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember testifying that you and Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn together signed your contract under date of February 1?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I don't remember saying that. I believe the record will say that I signed it with Mr. Kahn, and the contract was sent over to Mr. Cameron's office, where he signed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Who wrote your contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Cameron.

The CHAIRMAN. And your original contract called for $900 down-payment; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. $900 advance.

The CHAIRMAN. Your subsequent contract called for how much advance?

Mr. MATUSOW. The subsequent contract called for $1,500, because that is how much I had received.

The CHAIRMAN. $1,500. What was your royalty under the first contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. On the paperbound book, 14 percent of the price to the dealers.

The CHAIRMAN. Fourteen percent?

Mr. MATUSOW. Or $1.25 per book.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the percentage in the second contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might be off a percent or so, but it said 15 percent for the first 5,000 copies originally. The royalty was to go up to 20 percent for the next 10,000, or the next 5,000, and then up to 25,000.

In the supplemental agreement it called for 15 percent for the first 2,500 copies, 20 percent for the next 5,000, bringing it up to a total of 67,500 books, and 25 percent for all books thereafter.

I have figured the difference in price out, and if on both contracts the 15,000 books were reached, and the original price was the same on both contracts, there would be an advantage to me of $900 total royalty, and nothing higher, but that is negated by the fact that originally the book was planned to be $5 for 350 pages, while the book is now 256 pages and will sell for $3, which makes it a lower royalty rate, and in the ultimate, less money on the second contract than on the first.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember testifying that you and Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn together signed your contract under date of February 1?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I said we all signed it on February 1. I don't recall stating that the three of us signed it together.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you first state that you signed it together and then subsequently testified that Mr. Cameron was not in town at the time, and he signed it subsequently?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that is how it went. It is quite possible.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your first testimony was:

> My recollection is that we signed it together that is, Mr. Kahn and myself, I believe, I signed it first, and then Mr. Kahn did, and Mr. Cameron was the last one to sign it.

You subsequently testified:

> Mr. Cameron was not in town at the time, and he signed it subsequent to my signing it, and Mr. Kahn signing it.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to clear that point up in the record. In the signing of this contract, who signed it first?

Mr. MATUSOW. Physically I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then Mr. Kahn signed it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Right, he was with me at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were together at that time?
Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, in room 122, Hotel Chelsea.
Mr. SOURWINE. You saw him sign it?
Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.
Mr. SOURWINE. He saw you sign it?
Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.
Mr. SOURWINE. Then it was sent to Mr. Cameron to sign?
Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. He was out of town, or at the office.
Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know when Mr. Cameron signed it?
Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is he signed it that day. It might have been the next day.
Mr. SOURWINE. On the difference in royalties, haven't you testified under oath the second contract meant a difference of $800 more in royalty?
Mr. MATUSOW. If both prices had been the same, it would have meant eight or nine hundred dollars additional to me, but the fact is both prices are not the same.
Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't tell the court if they were the same, you just said it made a difference of about $800.
Mr. MATUSOW. I am giving you a more clear and precise answer.
Mr. SOURWINE. Than you testified to?
Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.
Mr. SOURWINE. You have testified that you did not know that Mine, Mill was going to buy 2,000 copies of your book, until after you had written the book; is that right?
Mr. MATUSOW. Until after I had written the book, and after I had signed any affidavits.
Mr. SOURWINE. Is it correct that you did not know of that initial agreement by Mine, Mill to purchase copies of your book until the same time, when you learned that they had subsequently increased that agreement?
Mr. MATUSOW. It is possible, sir. Things were happening quite fast in the first few days of February, the first week, and I recall somebody telling me they were going to buy some books, 2,000, 5,000, something like that, very vague in my mind as to the specifics involved there.
Mr. SOURWINE. I am trying to refresh your memory. Didn't you learn from Nathan Witt that the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union had agreed to buy 2,000 copies of your book?
Mr. MATUSOW. The first knowledge I had of the Mine, Mill Union purchasing copies of my book was from Mr. Kahn, not Nathan Witt.
May I have some water?
Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. I am sure you may have some water.
Do you know now that Mine, Mill has agreed to buy 6,700 copies of your book and that the Canadian Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers is to buy another 5,000 copies?
Mr. MATUSOW. I was informed about that. I presume that is correct.
Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what book clubs are to distribute your book?
Mr. MATUSOW. Haven't the slightest idea.
Mr. SOURWINE. Have you discussed with anyone the distribution of your book by the Liberty Book Club?
Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.
Mr. SOURWINE. By the Union Shop Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know anything about the Liberty Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was a member of it once.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Carl Marzani?

Mr. MATUSOW. I know he is associated with Cameron Associates.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that Carl Marzani is editor of the Liberty Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Carl Marzani is or was a member of the Communist Party, USA?

Mr. MATUSOW. No knowledge of that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where the Liberty Book Club has its headquarters?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where?

Mr. MATUSOW. 100 West 23d Street, New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where is that with relation to the headquarters of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea where the Communist Party headquarters is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where the Liberty Book Club has its west coast offices?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where those offices are with respect to the offices of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not the slightest. I don't know where the Communist Party offices are.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you personally, Mr. Matusow, correct any galley proofs for your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you correct any page proofs?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me? Page proofs?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did your publishers suggest any changes on the page proofs?

Mr. MATUSOW. Just editorially, typos, typographical errors.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did they suggest any deletions?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I recall, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did anybody else suggest any changes?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I recall. There might have been one or two. I am inclined to think there might have been one or two in relation to libel law, but I don't recall specifically.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, when you and Mr. Kahn were making tape recordings prior to the time you started dictating your book, did you control the tape recorder?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that tape recorder on all of the time during the session, or did you turn it off and on?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I turned it off and on. Mr. Kahn is all thumbs on electronic devices. I think he would have fouled it up.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the beginning of the recording session, did you leave it on until the session was over?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. It is a very old machine. I have done all the work, and would like to apologize to the committee for the condition of reel No. 1. It was originally a paper tape, and it was affected by some magnetic device. It is therefore in very poor shape. You have a dubbing, but a true copy of it, and that is the best I can do for it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it true that the tape or the wire was turned on for a bit of conversation, then turned off, and then there would be additional conversation and then when you got ready to record, you turned it on again; is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That happened any number of times during the daily session?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that the tape does not purport to be in any way a true or complete record of the conversations you and Mr. Kahn had throughout the afternoon?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; that's right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, when did you begin your dictation to the tape?

Mr. MATUSOW. The conversations with Mr. Kahn?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. In the month of November.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are sure it wasn't about the 16th of November?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very possible, sir. I believe the date is on the tape itself.

Mr. SOURWINE. And when did you stop?

Mr. MATUSOW. Whatever the date is on tape No. 12.

Mr. SOURWINE. About December 8?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very possible, sir. Yes; I seem to recall in one of the recordings dictating on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you start dictating from the transcriptions of the tape?

Mr. MATUSOW. Throughout the writing, sir. In actuality I don't think I used more than 30 percent of that tape.

Mr. SOURWINE. And when did you finish your dictation of the book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have a copy of it, but I believe Mr. Kahn has had a schedule which I worked out. I believe it was the 10th or 11th of January.

Mr. SOURWINE. You dictated your book in not more than 5 weeks?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was about 5 weeks. Might I add, sir, during the days of dictation on the last two tapes I believe I was already dictating to a secretary.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you stop for Christmas?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, Christmas Day I didn't work, and Christmas Eve, that day I didn't work. I think I took 2 or 3 days off then, the whole weekend.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the designing of the jacket of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. The dust cover?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, Mr. Kahn showed me the thing, the jacket, and asked me if I approved of it. Only in respect that I furnished Mr. Kahn with a photograph which was used on the dust jacket.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who wrote the blurb for the book?

Mr. MATUSOW. What are you referring to, sir, if I may?

Mr. SOURWINE. The self-description of the book inside the dust cover.

Mr. MATUSOW. This?

Mr. SOURWINE. I don't know about "this." You have there the paper-bound edition. There is a hard-back edition.

Mr. MATUSOW. This would be on the inside flyleaf. This would be the same.

Senator WELKER. May I interrupt counsel for a moment. I want to ask you for the last time——

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry, sir, I didn't hear you.

Senator WELKER. I want to ask you for the last time, so it will be clear for the record, when you received any money from the FBI, the Department of Justice——

Mr. MATUSOW. That's another story, sir.

Senator WELKER. For being a so-called stool pigeon, as you call it.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. Previously you asked me the last time I received money from the FBI, and I said my recollection was 1950. The last time I received money from the Department of Justice I believe was in June of 1954, from the Internal Security section of the Department of Justice. I believe I picked up a check here in Washington at the United States marshal's office.

Senator WELKER. You are speaking now about the section down in Justice, not our Internal Security?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, the section of Justice. That is, to the best of my recollection.

Senator WELKER. I see. How much was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. I believe it was 4 or 5 days as a witness at $25 a day. That would be maybe a hundred and a quarter, something like that.

Senator WELKER. And is that the last time you can recall?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe they also had a $9 a day per diem that they forwarded to me, and I received in July for about $60 or $50.

Senator WELKER. Now, I want to ask you this: Did you inform the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Mr. and Mrs. Craig Vincent were Communists in connection with your reports from San Cristobal Valley Ranch in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. Are you referring to reports I made in the year 1950?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. I would have to see those reports. Frankly, I don't think I did in those reports.

Senator WELKER. You don't think. Now, will you answer me yes or no on that?

Mr. MATUSOW. The only way I can say, sir, I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. Certainly you wouldn't make an accusation without knowing whether it was true or false.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I don't know if I made that accusation in 1950.

Senator WELKER. You don't want to say whether you did or whether you did not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I would be lying to you if I said I knew yes or no. You want the truth, sir.

Senator WELKER. All right. Did you also say then that Henry Collins, Jr., was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea, sir. I would very much like to see those reports. They have since been offered in evidence in Judge Dimock's court, and I presume that the committee can get those reports, and if I were able to look at them, I would know definitely whether I did or didn't.

Senator WELKER. No doubt you would.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Have you testified that you knew nothing of any Communist activity at the San Cristobal Valley ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said—I don't recall what I said specifically, but in substance I believe I said to this committee that I did not know specifically of Communist Party activities at the ranch.

Senator WELKER. Once again, you can't answer that one "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was not active—I was a member of the Communist Party, but I was not an active Communist when I was at that ranch, and I did not take part in Communist activities.

Senator WELKER. You want to leave it with the committee that you cannot say whether or not—you knew nothing of any Communist activities at the San Cristobal Valley ranch, notwithstanding the fact you were a Communist at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know of any Communist activities there, sir, nothing specific.

Senator WELKER. Didn't make any inquiry whatsoever?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. Pardon me, I think I once made an inquiry with somebody, but who was not connected with the ranch. He just happened to be there, and I can't remember his name now, but he was the State leader of the Communist Party in New Mexico.

Senator WELKER. State leader of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. He was the organizer for the State of New Mexico, it happened to be I think I saw him in Taos or at the ranch, I don't remember now, sir, and I think I said to him, "I am a member of the Communist Party, I'd like to transfer out to New Mexico," but he had no official connection with the ranch and no connection at all.

Senator WELKER. Is he the only person there that you knew to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. The only person I made an inquiry with, and the only person who I ever knew specifically was a member of the Communist Party, and even I didn't know of my own knowledge, but an FBI agent who I was in contact with in Santa Fe told me this fellow was a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the only person you knew specifically to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. That I can recall now, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "specifically"? Explain that to me.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, on the basis of surmise, as the committee has asked me before, do I know of my own knowledge. Well, I knew

of my own knowledge is what I am trying to say now, sir, and specifically or of my own knowledge I did not know that I can recall now.

The CHAIRMAN. "Specifically," does that mean you suspected others of being Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; just as I now suspect Miss Bentley told lies, the same type of suspect.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever hear Communists give a lecture at that ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I recall.

Senator WELKER. Not that you recall. Did you ever hear any Communist matters discussed at the San Cristobal Ranch in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is an ambiguous statement, sir, Communist matters. There are a lot of things.

Senator WELKER. I will make it as ambiguous as you want to make it. Did you ever hear it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know what you mean, sir. You are putting out a broad statement.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever hear Communist matters discussed there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Communist Party matters?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; only in relation to a discussion I had with this fellow who was State organizer of New Mexico Communist Party.

Senator WELKER. That is the only one?

Mr. MATUSOW. An inquiry I had given him, and he was very evasive in the answer, and that was the extent of specific Communist Party matters.

Senator WELKER. Didn't you identify yourself to him as a fellow Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said, "I'm a member of the Communist Party and I know you are the State organizer." He didn't admit it, though. The only way I knew it was because an FBI agent had told me he was.

Senator WELKER. I see. In other words, he didn't take your bait. He was evasive, is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; he was.

Senator WELKER. Now, did you ever see any Communist literature there at this ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I saw literature that I had seen at Communist Party headquarters; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Can you tell us what you saw?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I believe some books, I forget the titles of them, that had been published by international publishers. There were a lot of books there though, a lot of publishers.

Senator WELKER. You don't remember the names or anything of that nature?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not offhand, sir; no.

Senator WELKER. I think that is all I have now, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you have anything to do with the distribution of advance copies of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe only 1 or 2 copies, 1 I gave my parents. No, in fact, I didn't give it to them, not the mimeographed or galleys.

I think that is what you are talking about, sir. If we take it in stages——

Mr. SOURWINE. Advance copies of your book. You have already testified, I believe, that you had nothing to do with the distribution of advance mimeographed copies?

Mr. MATUSOW. That's right, and only in relation to a few friends who this weekend I gave a copy to; my parents and 2 or 3 people.

Mr. SOURWINE. You prepared no list of persons that was to get them?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the distribution of advance page proofs or galleys?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I suggested, and told, not only suggested but told Mr. Kahn, I wanted a copy sent to Jack Anderson here in Washington, and I can't think of anybody else who I specifically wanted to receive a copy of the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Anderson had already been sent one of the copies of the mimeographed texts?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I was talking about, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what you are talking about. I had asked you about page proofs or galleys.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think I picked up a copy of the galleys and gave them to a proprietor of a bookshop in New York who I knew was interested in the book. He wanted to see if he wanted to sell the book or not, and there might have been a copy or two. I am trying to think. Well, the copy I gave the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you remember testifying about your bicycle breaking down?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. It broke down several times, if I remember your testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, one bicycle broke down twice and the other one broke down once. There were two bicycles.

Mr. SOURWINE. They didn't break down completely until just before you got to——

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, it was up in Cimarron Canyon it broke down.

Mr. SOURWINE. And it did then break down completely?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What part broke?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, there were some bearings that needed greasing or the pedal, the sprocket wouldn't go right. I rehabilitated the bike. It was in good shape when I left Taos.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did it break down to the point where you couldn't ride it at all?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; it broke down between Raton and Cimarron. I had to hitchhike to get in there.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you have to do to rehabilitate that bicycle?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I cleaned out the dust and the grime that was in the bearings, and the sprocket and put a little grease in there, and got it working, worked it in a bit, and replaced a couple of bearings that had been missing.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you do that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I did that the morning after I got in Taos.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was the same morning you were going around Taos meeting various old friends and talking with them?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yeah.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were pretty busy that morning, weren't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was relaxing. I don't know how busy I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you have stated that you had planned to prospect for uranium.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, 2 other fellows, 2 radio announcers down in Dallas and myself, had decided we'd go up to Utah and maybe into Nevada and do some prospecting, 2 of us working in the field and 1 working in the radio station.

Mr. SOURWINE. They were radio announcers in Dallas?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yeah, excuse me, one was a radio announcer and—well, both of them had been radio announcers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you name them, please?

Mr. MATUSOW. You've got me now, sir. I can't for the life of me think of their names.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you see them after you left Dallas?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I had given them an address where I thought I would be able to be contacted when they got to Salt Lake.

Mr. SOURWINE. When were you last in Taos?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I don't remember the exact date, but the date that I left to come to New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. October of 1954, you mean?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was October 20, 21, something like that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before that, when was the last time you were in Taos?

Mr. MATUSOW. September of 1953.

Mr. SOURWINE. And before that?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1950—1951; pardon me, January–February 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you there in 1950, also?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it true that in 1950 and in 1951 and 1953, when you were in Taos you visited the San Cristobal Valley Ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; only in 1950.

Mr. SOURWINE. Only in 1950?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall going there in 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not go there in 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nor in 1954.

Mr. SOURWINE. Nor in 1954. Have you testified that while you were en route from Dallas to Taos you called up a friend in Salt Lake City?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall saying I might have called a friend in Salt Lake City. I know I called him from Dallas but whether I called him en route, I don't——

Mr. SOURWINE. You named that friend?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Cardall.

Mr. SOURWINE. First name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Richard.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you meet him?

Mr. MATUSOW. In Utah. I met him here in Washington when he was working in this office building.

Mr. SOURWINE. How do you know him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Fairly well.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you call him about when you telephoned him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I talked to him about theological matters which I hold privileged. I also asked him about how the television and radio work was, chances of getting work in Salt Lake, and I asked him about the situation in relation to prospecting.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is Mr. Cardall an official of any church?

Mr. MATUSOW. He is a member of a church. I believe he holds a priesthood in the church and therefore I discussed matters with him.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say he holds a priesthood?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean in the sense that every male member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints holds a priesthood?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so. Every male member can hold a priesthood, but not every one——

Mr. SOURWINE. You claim the privilege on that basis in regard to your conversation?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think my conversation with him in relation to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is a question which I will claim a privilege on, which has no bearing. Well, it is a privileged conversation and what happened there in such conversation is something I will not discuss.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you consulting him as a spiritual adviser?

Mr. MATUSOW. I won't discuss any question of any conversation in relation to theology with Mr. Cardall or any other member of the church.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are claiming the privilege?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. In that sense; yes, it was in that sense.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did consult him as a spiritual adviser?

Mr. MATUSOW. In that sense, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Matusow, have you denied here before this committee that you are an expert on communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have said I professed to be one at one time, and I am not an expert in that sense. Yes, sir, I denied it.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you have stated that you have read all or parts of several hundred books on communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Several hundred theoretical books; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were a member of the Communist Party for 4 years?

Mr. MATUSOW. Approximately 4; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were a trusted Communist and you were permitted to operate a switchboard in Communist Party headquarters?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; Communist Party county headquarters. Let's bring it down to its proper level.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, were you ever charged with stealing books?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. From the Jefferson School & Book Shop and the Worker's Book Shop?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know from where I had been accused of stealing it, but probably from those bookshops.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who made the charge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest—I think a Mr. Bordofsky, who was later expelled from the Communist Party for stealing books.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the charge true?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that charge ever made in open court by a Mary Kaufman?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might have been.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that was done?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would say it might have been. I don't recall it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with pilfering from a taxi company which employed you in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who made the charge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. It might have been Mr. McTernan.

Senator WELKER. Who?

Mr. MATUSOW. John T. McTernan, of Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. How much were you charged with stealing?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. Nobody ever gave me a figure. I don't have the slightest idea about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that charge true?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with having been caught by the Worker's Book Shop ringing up a $5.20 sale as 20 cents?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have been charged with that in court, but the charge is not true.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were charged with that by Mary Kaufman?

Mr. MATUSOW. Probably.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with irregularities in securing subscriptions for the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATUSOW. Many times.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that charge made by Mary Kaufman?

Mr. MATUSOW. By Mary Kaufman I believe, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it true?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with a shortage in your accounts in connection with the sale of subscriptions for the Young Republicans in Dayton, Ohio?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I know of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know that such a charge has been made against you?

Mr. MATUSOW. It's news to me. When was the charge made? I would like to know a little bit about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. We were concerned mainly with your knowledge of it at the moment, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I am curious about it. You are making the charge. Somebody made a charge. I would like to know about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question I am leading up to is this. You had a great many charges made against you which you deny as false, which were made by Mary Kaufman who was then and is now an attorney for the Communist Party or Communists.

I want to ask you in the face of the fact that she made false charges against you in open court, how did it happen that you have subsequently cooperated with her in the giving of affidavits?

Mr. MATUSOW. I stated before, sir, and I will state again, I gave false testimony in a court of law. People were convicted, I believe, on my testimony, or some were. If those people were convicted on the basis of my false testimony, then they ought to have a new trial. I don't care if the Government puts me in jail and throws the key away.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you learn anything while you were in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I learn something every day I live, whether it is in the Communist Party or not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did the Communist Party teach you anything?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not tangibly; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you learn some of the things that the Communist Party was teaching?

Mr. MATUSOW. I went to Communist Party schools. I doubt if I learned very much.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, what did the Communist Party teach about how to treat defectors from the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. Oh, probably I think it says to call them a Trotskyite, don't talk to them, ostracize them from your life, et cetera, just leave them alone, ignore them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Call them liars, call them stool pigeons?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, stool pigeon, informer, rat, scab, a lot of names.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, what did the Communist Party teach about how to act on the witness stand?

Mr. MATUSOW. I never learned anything. The only knowledge I have about what I am to do on the witness stand I have learned from Government attorneys and the congressional committee investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute now, sir. He asked you what the Communist Party taught about how to act on the witness stand. If they taught you anything——

Mr. MATUSOW. They taught me nothing. All my knowledge was learned from Government attorneys.

Senator WELKER. May I ask one question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Matusow, have you ever gone under an assumed name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I have had many aliases, sir, many.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you mind relating them to us?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might miss a few, but I did it the other day. I will do it again. Harvey Matt, which I used while in the Communist Party; Ralph Page, which I used while I was an investigator for the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission; Howard Markow, also used while an investigator for the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission; Harvey Marshall, which is not an assumed name but my first and second names, which I have used in show business for a number of years.

Senator WELKER. Did you say Howard Markow?

Mr. MATUSOW. I once used the name Howard Markow.

Senator WELKER. I believe, if I didn't misread your book, in your book I think you said it was Harvey Markow. Am I wrong on that?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might be a typo. I think you read it wrong, sir, or it's a typographical error. I believe you will find it in the chapter "Dayton Women for Peace."

Senator WELKER (reading):

I assumed the name of **Howard Markow.**

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; that is what I thought it said.

Senator WELKER (reading):

have just come from the Southwest.

Mr. MATUSOW. Right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Any other name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I had a nickname when I was a child, Kid Nickles, and younger in that period some of my friends used to call me Blackie, but other than that, I don't recall any other names.

Senator WELKER. Weren't you taking an awful chance, Mr. Matsu——

Mr. MATUSOW. Matusow. I am not an island in the Straits of Formosa, sir.

Senator WELKER. I had that on my mind, too.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I realize that.

Senator WELKER. I am very sorry for that.

Aren't you taking an awful chance at these meetings, using an assumed name? One of your fellow Commie members could have walked in, and you were in trouble.

Mr. MATUSOW. It happened to me at a meeting out in Ohio, somebody recognized me and two people came over to me and very politely said, "We would appreciate it if you would leave and don't come back." I walked out the door and nobody laid a hand on me, and that was it, and after that I didn't feel I was taking much of a chance, because they only asked me to leave.

Senator WELKER. Is that where the women had the peace——

Mr. MATUSOW. No, that was another meeting.

Senator WELKER. That is all I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Matusow, this committee is going to call Miss Bentley as a witness. I want you to dictate to the stenographer in full your charges against her veracity.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. I hope this committee calls Mr. Roy Cohn, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait just a minute. That is a decision the committee will make.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that Miss Bentley has under oath told falsehoods against people. I believe this because on at least one occasion, and now I recall a second occasion meeting with Miss Bentley, and Miss Bentley——

The CHAIRMAN. Let me see if we have got it all. It was your testimony about a dinner engagement. Is that the full knowledge that you have about her swearing falsely, where she told you so?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is your full knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. Where she told me——

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything that you know that is not in this record about her testifying falsely?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I stated, sir, that the galley proofs and the manuscript of her book would bear out some of my accusations.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the record.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, no, sir, I believe what is in the record at this point is the extent of my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the extent of your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Now, you have brought certain charges——

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir, please. I would like to consult with counsel on something.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, might I request the committee that copies of Miss Bentley's testimony, if they could be furnished me, I might read them and might come up with something out of my own knowledge, if the committee is interested. I would be glad to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter that will be taken under advisement.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you have brought certain charges against the witness named Paul Crouch.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to know if those charges are confined to certain alleged discrepancies in his testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. They are confined to those alleged discrepancies and, sir, my personal relations and contact with Mr. Crouch over a period of 2 or 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that in the record?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Your relationship with Mr. Crouch?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Federation of Former Communists, and I will endeavor to locate any further correspondence and furnish the committee with that material.

The CHAIRMAN. What I want to be certain of is this: that the full knowledge, the full information that you have about Mr. Crouch's testimony is in the record.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Senator WELKER. Just a moment.

Mr. Witness, did you ever say in your book that Whittaker Chambers testified falsely?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall if I put it that buntly in the book. I might have said, I believe—I don"t think I said it that way. I believe I can find what I said about Mr. Chambers, if I may.

Senator WELKER. I wish you would. I thought I had it here, but I couldn't——

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any knowledge about Mr. Chambers?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I never met Mr. Chambers. I will find the exact quote where I refer to him. I will check the index here. I have an opinion about Mr. Chambers, but that is just an opinion. I said here—may I quote, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. On page 67, to get the full context of the meaning of what I said about Mr. Chambers, last paragraph on page 67:

> Clements' statement about Lindbergh's crossing the Atlantic stuck in my mind. There were many ex-Communists who had crossed their Atlantic. And not too many of them could find the gimmick needed to make the headlines. There was Matt Cvetic's gimmick, "I was a Communist for the FBI;" Herbert Philbrick's family gimmick, "I led three lives;" Elizabeth Bentley, "the spy queen;" Paul Crouch, "of the Armed Forces;" Whittaker Chambers and his "pumpkin papers;" Louis Budenz and his theological approach.
>
> There was little left for Harvey Matusow. The more I thought of this, the more determined I became to make youth my gimmick.

Senator WELKER. Your gimmick then was youth?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. To match these other people. And you didn't infer with respect to Whittaker Chambers, Mr. Budenz, that they had committed perjury at any time?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I didn't believe I spelled it out in detail, sir. There are many unwritten chapters to this book. Time didn't allow the writing of them.

Senator WELKER. Do you know any acts, any statements under oath given by Herbert Philbrick?

Mr. MATUSOW. No.

Senator WELKER. Just a moment. Paul Crouch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Can we take them one at a time, sir?

Senator WELKER. Or anyone else, given before congressional committees, courts of law, or grand juries, which were perjury?

Mr. MATUSOW. Taking them one at a time, I am not accusing Mr. Philbrick of anything. My personal opinion is Mr. Philbrick never knew anything about the Communist Party in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not interested in that.

Mr. MATUSOW. You asked me, sir. I know nothing about Mr. Philbrick. As I say, his knowledge of Communists was very limited up in Boston. He never had a chance to know anything, if anything existed. As far as Matt Cvetic is concerned, I wouldn't trust him with a 10-foot pole.

Senator WELKER. I am sure Mr. Cvetic would trust you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I realize that, but his radio show, he himself has admitted to me, and I state in the book, is full of lies purported to be truth.

Senator WELKER. Can you tell us one now?

Now you have made an accusation under oath.

Mr. MATUSOW. In the picture, for instance, "I was a Communist for the FBI," which was purported to be truthful about Mr. Cvetic, there is an incident about his having a gun duel with Communist Party members in a railway tunnel. That never happened. Mr. Cvetic told me it never happened.

Senator WELKER. He told you that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And in whose presence did he tell you that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator WELKER. Anyone else present?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator WELKER. Would you say——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall who else was present. I don't recall who else was present.

Senator WELKER. On such an important matter?

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, I was playing the same game he was at the time, sir. It wasn't that important.

Senator WELKER. You swore this fellow had a gimmick and you so stated in your book.

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, sir, I knew that the radio show that he had and the motion picture were full of holes and was phony.

Senator WELKER. All right, you stated a moment ago that he stated a falsehood.

Mr. MATUSOW. He told me he never had any gun battle in a tunnel in Pittsburgh with any Communist agents. I talked to him about the possibility of my writing some scripts, fictionalized stories of the Communist Party, which he would try and get used on his radio show, and if I were going to write the scripts as fiction, and he said, "I will try to get them used," certainly it wasn't a story of his experience in the Communist Party which he and the people who produced his show tried to make the American public believe were true facts.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, in closing you omit to mention Mary Markward.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know nothing about Mary Markward, nothing about the woman.

Senator WELKER. A very famous undercover agent for the FBI.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know nothing about Mary Markward other than what I have read in the papers, and I don't want to base it on surmise.

Senator WELKER. I thought you were quite an expert on Communists and undercover agents.

Mr. MATUSOW. I never said I was an expert.

Senator WELKER. I think you have missed one of the greatest.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have heard the name but I am not going around blatantly taking names out of the air and throwing them at people. I have met Mr. Crouch, Budenz, Cvetic, and Miss Bentley.

Senator WELKER. And like the chairman suggested a moment ago, if you would just name under oath those overt acts of perjury that they committed, we would appreciate it very much.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know the overt acts. They are very clever at committing that perjury, just as I had been clever at telling falsehoods.

Senator WELKER. Yes, sir, indeed you are right on that.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, we had good training.

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, I will finish your book tonight. I haven't had a chance to finish it all. Hasn't it been your ambition to write a book since you came into this business of an informer?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, sir, I have wanted to write for a long time, and I continue to write.

Senator WELKER. You wanted to write a book for what purpose?

Mr. MATUSOW. This book?

Senator WELKER. To make money or to aid the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. This book was not written for a money book purpose, money motive. I have had many money motives in my life, and I still do in relation to other work.

When I write a TV script, I do it for a money motive. When I write comedy material for anybody on network TV, if I can sell it, that is done for a money motive.

Senator WELKER. Have you done pretty well at that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have sold some stuff, sir.

Senator WELKER. You don't want to leave this committee with the impression that you are quite a TV writer?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I am a novice at writing. I am quite new at the game, but I can write.

Senator WELKER. I wouldn't doubt that at all, if you can write like you can talk, you can.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is the way I write.

Senator WELKER. That is all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you not know this committee was attempting to serve you with a subpena before we served you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe a half hour or so prior to the service of the subpena that the committee's investigator, Frank Schroeder, was at the office of Cameron & Kahn, a phone call was made to the Chelsea Hotel of Rockaway, informing me of that fact, and I waited for the subpena server.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not know it earlier than that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you dodging the subpena service?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you stay at your home on Wednesday night before you were served with the subpena?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. I might have stayed at the hotel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you stay Thursday night?

Mr. MATUSOW. Thursday of what week, sir?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Thursday night before you were served with the subpena.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have the slightest—wait a minute, now was that in January? I would like to have the date because at one time I was out of the city.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember the night that you stayed in a motel in Westchester County?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I am getting at, sir. Yes, I do very definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. Name it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea. It was a "lulu," though, an Arabic name, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Why didn't you register under your own name?

Mr. MATUSOW. I wanted to get away from the press and anybody else, so I could complete work on the galleys of the book.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Herb Tank.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Thursday night before you were served with the subpena, you were at that motel, weren't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I believe the dates were wrong. Trace it datewise.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Thursday night before you were served with that subpena, you were at Mr. Kahn's house?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I don't think so, sir. Let's get the date, the day and the month, because a lot of weeks have flipped by; I mean, seem to have gone by pretty quickly, and I have been a lot of places in the last few weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember the occasion on which you——

Mr. MATUSOW. This committee served me with three subpenas, don't forget, so we have to establish which one.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember, Mr. Matusow, the occasion where you slept at a motel after having registered under an assumed name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yup; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you done that more than once?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not in a motel. Twice in a hotel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you there in a motel in Westchester County?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, the night before you were at that motel, where did you sleep?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe the Hotel Ossining, in Ossining, N. Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. And the night after?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was a Sunday night—Saturday night. Sunday night, in the motel. To be specific, Sunday night, checked in the 30th of January, and left on Monday morning, the 31st, at about 7 in the morning, or 6:30. The evening of the 29th, which I believe was a Saturday, was spent at the Hotel Ossining, in Ossining, N. Y. The evening of the 28th, which was a Friday, and the evening of the 27th, which is a Thursday, was spent at the Hotel Alexander Hamilton in Paterson, N. J.; prior to that at the Chelsea Hotel, 222 West 23d Street, New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you spend any of those evenings at the home of Mr. Kahn in Croton-on-Hudson?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had dinner there on Sunday, the 30th, but I didn't spend the evening there.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't, on any of those dates you had testified about, spend the whole night at Mr. Kahn's home?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not on that Thursday, Friday, Saturday, or Sunday.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is your testimony under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you last spend the night at Mr. Kahn's home?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea—Excuse me; I think it was the night after I got served the subpena.

Let's see; my recollection is it might have been the 5th of February, but I am not sure. I was served the subpena for the grand jury on the 3d of February, or the 2d, Wednesday the 2d. On Thursday the 3d, I had a press conference. Friday the 4th, I believe I was in New York, and left at about 11 o'clock that night, or 10 o'clock; went to Croton with Mr. Kahn Friday the 4th, and I believe I stayed there the 5th and the 6th, Saturday and Sunday.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is Friday the 4th, you are testifying you left New York with Mr. Kahn, about 11 o'clock at night?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might have been 9 o'clock, I forget.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might it have been 8 o'clock?

Mr. MATUSOW. It could have even been 7.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might it have been 6 o'clock?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might it have been 5 o'clock?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Weren't you, as a matter of fact, in Croton-on-Hudson before 8 o'clock that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your best recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. My best recollection is I have been to Croton-on-Hudson on a number of occasions in recent weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you let me ask the question?

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir; go ahead.

Mr. SOURWINE. You testified you went to Croton-on-Hudson with Mr. Kahn on a particular evening, to wit, this Friday. What is your best recollection as to when you got there, what time of the evening?

Mr. MATUSOW. My best recollection is that I arrived at about 10 in the evening.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, is there anything——

Mr. MATUSOW. Caught an 8:25 train, I think.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there anything that went on that evening that fixes the date in your memory?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I just seem to recall spending the weekend there; that's all—that weekend.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Kahn was with you in New York and went with you to Croton-on-Hudson?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was there a meeting at Mr. Kahn's home that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are sure about that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember any meeting at Mr. Kahn's home.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever attend a meeting of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade at Mr. Kahn's home?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. May we pause, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

We will take a recess until 10 a. m.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 p. m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 1, 1955.)

×